arXiv:1703.06328v1 [math.PR] 18 Mar 2017

Submitted to the Annals of Applied Probability

FUNCTIONAL CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM FOR SUSCEPTIBLE-INFECTED PROCESS ON CONFIGURATION MODEL GRAPHS

By Wasiur R. KhudaBukhsh[‡,*], Casper Woroszylo[§], Grzegorz A. Rempała[§,†] and Heinz Koeppl[‡]

Technische Universität Darmstadt[‡] *and The Ohio State University*[§]

We study a stochastic compartmental susceptible-infected (SI) epidemic process on a configuration model random graph with a given degree distribution over a finite time interval $[0, T]$, for some $T > 0$. In this setting, we split the population of graph nodes into two compartments, namely, S and I, denoting the susceptible and infected nodes, respectively. In addition to the sizes of these two compartments, we study counts of SI-edges (those connecting a susceptible and an infected node) and SS-edges (those connecting two susceptible nodes). We describe the dynamical process in terms of these counts and present a functional central limit theorem (FCLT) for them, a scaling limit of the dynamical process as n, the number of nodes in the random graph, grows to infinity. To be precise, we show that these counts, when appropriately scaled, converge weakly to a continuous Gaussian vector martingale process in the usual Skorohod space of real 3-dimensional vector-valued càdlàg functions on $[0, T]$ endowed with the Skorohod topology. We assume certain technical requirements for this purpose. We discuss applications of our FCLT in percolation theory (from a non-equilibrium statistical mechanics point of view), and in computer science in the context of spread of computer viruses. We also provide simulation results for some common degree distributions.

1. Introduction. Scaling limits of dynamical processes on random graphs have received much attention of late. Although dynamical processes on random graphs themselves have long been studied by mathematicians, physicists, epidemiologists, computer scientists and engineers, a comprehensive and mathematically rigorous body of work on various scaling limits (such

*Supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) within the Collaborative Research Center (CRC) 1053 – MAKI.

†Supported by the US National Science Foundation under grant DMS-1513489 and DMS-1440386.

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 60F17, 60F05, 92D30; secondary 05C80.

Keywords and phrases: SI process, Functional CLT, Configuration model, Random graphs, Scaling limit, Non-equilibrium percolation, Mathematical model of epidemic, Spread of computer virus

as the laws of large numbers and functional central limit theorems) under general settings remains elusive. Such scaling limits have been derived rigorously only for a handful of special cases to date. Notable breakthroughs in the context of epidemiological processes include Andersson (1998); Decreusefond et al. (2012); Janson, Luczak and Windridge (2014); Jacobsen et al. (2016), appearing primarily in probability literature. They provide laws of large numbers results under various sets of technical assumptions. However, to complement the laws of large numbers, scaling limits in the form of functional central limit theorems (FCLTs) have not been well investigated to the best of our knowledge. We are not aware of any rigorously derived FCLT for dynamical processes on random graphs, except for diffusion-type approximations attempted in special cases like an early-stage epidemic in Graham and House (2014). In this paper, we provide an FCLT for the stochastic susceptible-infected (SI) process on configuration model random graphs (see (van der Hofstad, 2017, Chapter 7), Bollobás (2001)) as n, the number of nodes in the graph, grows to infinity.

1.1. *Related Works.* We come across a host of dynamical processes arising from epidemiology (Brauer and van den Driessche (2003); Newman (2002); Graham and House (2014)), biology (Albert (2004); Alon (2007)), statistical physics (Baxter (1989); Bollobás and Riordan (2006)), and computer science (Lelarge (2012); Kephart and White (1993); Lelarge (2012); Wierman and Marchette (2004)). These dynamical processes are often similar and hence, lend themselves to application across disciplines (Pastor-Satorras and Vespignani (2001a,b)).

In pursuit of scaling limits, much of the research has been inspired by the mean-field approach from statistical physics. Pastor-Satorras and Vespignani (2001a,b) study epidemic dynamics on scale-free networks of Barabási and Albert (1999). The majority of work in this direction aims to obtain limiting Ordinary Differential Equations (ODEs) for the proportions of different compartments of the population. Notwithstanding the simplicity of these methods, the scaling limits presented are approximate and lack mathematical rigour. See Durrett (2010a, Chapter 1) for a critique.

The standard mean-field method was further improved by use of pair-approximation in Joo and Lebowitz (2004); Gleeson (2011); Mata, Ferreira and Ferreira (2014). Several other improvements yielding less approximate results have been proposed afterwards. A detailed account is presented in Barrat, Barthélemy and Vespignani (2008). Some of these approximate results have been followed up by probabilists and improved upon (Durrett (2010a,b); Chatterjee and Durrett (2009)).

In an epidemiological context, Andersson (1998) derived limit theorems for a discrete-time random graph epidemic model under rather restrictive assumptions on the degree sequence such as finiteness of a $(4+\delta)$-th moment, for some $\delta > 0$. Volz (2008) presented scaling limits for an SIR model on random graphs in the form of ODEs. Decreusefond et al. (2012) later proved Volz's results rigorously by summarising the epidemic process on configuration model random graphs into some measure-valued equations. Several similar laws of large numbers-type scaling limit under varying sets of technical assumptions surfaced afterwards. For example, Bohman and Picollelli (2012); Barbour and Reinert (2013) assume uniformly bounded degrees, Janson, Luczak and Windridge (2014) assume degree of a randomly chosen susceptible vertex to be uniformly integrable and the maximum degree of initially infected nodes to be $o(n)$, where n is the number of vertices in the graph. Recently Jacobsen et al. (2016) derived a similar law of large numbers for the stochastic SIR process on a multilayer configuration model assuming finiteness of the second moment of the underlying degree distribution.

1.2. *Our Contribution.* In this paper, we study a stochastic compartmental susceptible-infected (SI) epidemic process on a configuration model random graph with a given degree distribution over a finite time interval $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_T := [0, T]$, for some $T > 0$ (see Figure 1). In this setting, we split the population into two compartments, namely, S and I, denoting the susceptible and infected individuals, respectively. In addition to the sizes of these two compartments, we consider counts of SI-edges (those connecting a susceptible and an infected individual) and SS-edges (those connecting two susceptible individuals). We describe the dynamical process in terms of these counts and present a functional central limit theorem (FCLT) for them as n, the number of nodes in the random graph, grows to infinity. To be precise, we show that these counts, when appropriately scaled, converge weakly to a continuous Gaussian vector martingale process in the usual Skorohod space of real 3-dimensional vector-valued càdlàg functions on $\mathcal{T}$ endowed with the Skorohod topology. We assume certain technical requirements for this purpose. Formal details are provided in Theorem 2 in Section 3 which describes our FCLT result. The proof of Theorem 2 is preceded by the discussion of the related law of large numbers in Section 2 as well as some technical lemmas. In Section 4 we discuss applications of our FCLT in percolation theory (from a non-equilibrium statistical mechanics point of view), and in computer science in the context of spread of computer viruses. For illustration, we provide simulation results for some common degree distributions.

1.3. *Proof Strategy.* Our derivation relies on the application of a functional central limit theorem for local martingales (and hence, for martingales too) due to Rebolledo, referred to as the *Rebolledo's theorem* hereinafter. Rebolledo (1980) provided appropriate sufficient conditions for the convergence of local martingales to a continuous Gaussian (vector) martingale in terms of the associated optional and predictable quadratic variation processes[1], and the martingale process containing "big" jumps of the original process. Helland (1982) later provided a simpler proof of the *Rebolledo's theorem*. Interested readers are referred to Andersen et al. (1993); Aalen, Borgan and Gjessing (2008) for applications of the theorem to various statistical problems.

The first step towards the FCLT is to perform a Doob-Meyer decomposition (Meyer (1962); Rao (1969)) of the vector of counts into a zero-mean martingale and a compensator. Then we show that the predictable quadratic variation of the appropriately rescaled martingale process converges in probability to a deterministic quantity. Furthermore, in the limit, its sample paths turn out to be close to continuous in the sense that its "big" jumps vanish. Weak convergence in the sense of Billingsley (1999) is then established by the application of Rebolledo's functional central limit theorem for local martingales (Rebolledo (1980)).

1.4. *Notational Conventions.* We use the notations $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{R}$ to denote the set of natural numbers and the set of real numbers respectively. Also, we use $\mathbb{N}_0 \coloneqq \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\mathbb{R}_+ \coloneqq \mathbb{R} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$. Given $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, we denote the σ-field of Borel subsets of R by $\mathcal{B}(R)$. Unless otherwise mentioned, $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_T \coloneqq [0, T]$, for some $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$, will denote our fixed time interval of interest. We denote by $D = D(\mathcal{T})$ the Polish space of real functions f on $\mathcal{T}$ that are right continuous and have left hand limits. A function $f \in D$ is called càdlàg. Unless otherwise mentioned, the space D is assumed endowed with the Skorohod topology (Billingsley, 1999, Chapter 3) and accordingly we call D the Skorohod space. Let the triplet $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathrm{P})$ denote our probability space. For an event A, we use $\mathbb{1}(A)$ to denote the indicator (or characteristic) function of A. We shall use the following shorthand notation $(a)_b = a(a-1)(a-2)\cdots(a-b+1)$ for $a > b$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$. The symbols $O(.)$ and $o(.)$ are the big O and small o notations respectively, and they carry their usual meanings. A comprehensive list of symbols is provided in Appendix C for ease of reference.

1.5. *Model.* We begin with the class of all configuration model (CM) random graphs (van der Hofstad, 2017, Chapter 7) with n nodes, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

[1]The predictable quadratic variation (covariation in case of a vector) process is also known as pointed-brackets process, variance process etc.



Fig 1: Dynamics of the stochastic SI model over a finite time interval $\mathcal{T}$. Susceptible nodes are shown in yellowish green and infected nodes, in dark red. Infected nodes infect their neighbours at a given rate $\beta > 0$. Different types of edges, namely, SI, SS, and II, are shown in different colours. Note that in the context of non-equilibrium percolation, which we model as a stochastic SI process, the red nodes are the wet (or active) nodes and the growth of the red-component describes the time evolution of the percolated component.

The main advantage of the configuration model is that it allows one to fix the degrees before constructing the graph itself. There are numerous real life situations where random graphs with a prescribed degree sequence (or a distribution) are reasonable and intuitive. Please see van der Hofstad (2017, Chapter 7) for some examples.

Given a sequence of degrees $(d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n)$ for n vertices, we first assign d_i half-edges to node i. The configuration model random graph is then obtained by uniformly matching (or pairing) all available half-edges. Two paired half-edges form an edge. To be precise, we actually get a *multigraph* because the resultant graph may have self-loops and multiple edges. However, we can circumvent this problem by conditioning on simplicity[2] as $n \to \infty$. As shown in Janson (2009), this can be done because the probability that the random multigraph is simple is strictly positive provided $\sum_i d_i^2 = O(\sum_i d_i)$ (or equivalently, after ignoring isolated vertices, $\sum_i d_i^2 = O(n)$). We assume this condition to be satisfied in our setting.

Let us denote the probability generating function (PGF) of the underlying degree distribution by ψ, *i.e.*,

$$\psi(x) := \sum_k x^k p_k, \tag{1}$$

[2]A graph is "simple" if there is no self-loop and if there is at most one edge between any pair of vertices (*i.e.*, multiple edges are not allowed).

where p_k is the probability that a randomly chosen node has degree k. We denote the class of all CM random graphs with n nodes by $\mathcal{G}(\psi, n)$.

We consider the stochastic susceptible-infected (SI) model on CM random graphs. Each infected individual (represented by a node of the graph) infects one of its neighbours at rate $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$. We split the population into two compartments, namely, S and I, consisting respectively of the susceptible and infected individuals. One may draw a parallel between our model and the standard susceptible-infected-removed (SIR) model of Kermack and McKendrick (1927) by setting the recovery rate to zero.

Let $X(t) \coloneqq (X_S(t), X_{SI}(t), X_{SS}(t))$ denote the aggregated state vector of the system at time $t \geq 0$, where $X_S(t), X_{SI}(t)$ and $X_{SS}(t)$ respectively indicate the number of susceptible individuals, the number of SI edges (edges connecting an S-type individual and an I-type individual) and the number of SS edges. Please note that X_{SS} counts these edges twice. We shall often omit the time t if there is no ambiguity. Define the filtration

$$\mathcal{F}_t \coloneqq \sigma(\{X(s) \mid s \in [0, t]\}), \tag{2}$$

the σ-field generated by the process history up to and including time $t > 0$ (Durrett, 2010c, Chapter 1, p. 14) and let $\mathcal{F}_0$ also contain *all* P-null sets in $\mathcal{F}$. We need to include all P-null sets in $\mathcal{F}$ so that the filtration family $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ is complete. Also it is right continuous because it is generated by a right continuous jump process (Andersen et al., 1993, Chapter II, p. 61). Therefore, the usual Dellacherie's conditions on $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ are satisfied (Rebolledo, 1980; Karatzas and Shreve, 1991; Fleming and Harrington).[3]

By the *Doob-Meyer decomposition theorem* (Meyer, 1962; Rao, 1969), we get

$$X(t) = X(0) + \int_0^t \mathbb{F}_X(X(s))\, ds + M'(t), \tag{3}$$

where $M'(t) \coloneqq (M'_S(t), M'_{SI}(t), M'_{SS}(t))$ is a zero-mean martingale adapted to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t$ and $\mathbb{F}_X(X) \coloneqq (\mathbb{F}_S(X_S), \mathbb{F}_{SI}(X_{SS}, X_{SI}), \mathbb{F}_{SS}(X_{SS}, X_{SI}))$

[3]A filtering family $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ is said to be right continuous if $\mathcal{F}_{t+} = \mathcal{F}_t$ for every $t \geq 0$ where $\mathcal{F}_{t+}$ is the *σ-field of events immediately after t*, *i.e.*, $\mathcal{F}_{t+} \coloneqq \cap_{s>0}\mathcal{F}_{t+s}$. We refer interested readers to Karatzas and Shreve (1991, Chapter 1), Fleming and Harrington for more on why we need these two *usual* conditions on the filtering family for the study of stochastic processes with càdlàg sample paths.

is an integrable function given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{F}_S(X_S) &:= -\beta X_{SI}\\ \mathbb{F}_{SI}(X_{SS}, X_{SI}) &:= \sum_{i\in S} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})\\ \mathbb{F}_{SS}(X_{SS}, X_{SI}) &:= -2\sum_{i\in S} \beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i},\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $X_{SI,i}$ and $X_{SS,i}$ are respectively the numbers of infected and susceptible neighbours of a susceptible node i. Let $X_{S\bullet}(t)$ be the number of edges between a susceptible node and a node of any other status at time $t \geq 0$. We partition the collection of susceptible nodes S by their degree $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ so that $S = \cup_k S_k$. Therefore, we have $X_S = \sum_k X_{S_k}$ and

$$X_{S\bullet}(t) := \sum_k k X_{S_k}(t). \tag{5}$$

To study the large graph limit of the system, we also define the following quantity

$$\theta(t) := \exp\big(-\beta \int_0^t \frac{X_{SI}(s)}{X_{S\bullet}(s)}\, ds\big), \tag{6}$$

which can be intuitively described as the probability that a degree-1 node that was susceptible at time zero remains susceptible till time $t > 0$ (Volz (2008); Miller (2011); Miller, Slim and Volz (2012)). It may be described equivalently as

$$\theta(t) = \theta(0) + \int_0^t \mathbb{F}_\theta(X_{SI}(s), X_{S\bullet}(s), \theta(s))\, ds,$$

where

$$\mathbb{F}_\theta(X_{SI}, X_{S\bullet}, \theta) := -\beta\theta \frac{X_{SI}}{X_{S\bullet}},$$

with $\theta(0) = 1$.

2. The Law of Large Numbers. We adopt the framework of Jacobsen et al. (2016) for our purpose and make the following technical assumptions. Let $\mathcal{T}_0 := (0, T] \subset \mathcal{T}$.

A1 For $t \in \mathcal{T}_0$, $X_{S\bullet}(t) \to \infty$ with high probability (w.h.p.).[4] This assumption ensures the infection does not take over the entire graph and there are sufficiently many susceptible individuals throughout $\mathcal{T}_0$.

[4]For a sequence of random variables $\{Z_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, the phrase "$Z_n \to \infty$ with high probability (w.h.p.)" means "$\mathrm{P}(Z_n > k) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$ for any $k > 0$".

A2 The fraction of initially susceptible nodes converges to some α_S, *i.e.*,

$$n^{-1}X_S(0) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} \alpha_S. \tag{7}$$

We also assume that the initially infected and susceptible nodes are selected randomly and $\alpha_S > 0$. Note that the above also implies

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1}X_I(0) &\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} \alpha_I = 1 - \alpha_S, \\ n^{-1}X_{SI}(0) &\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} \alpha_{SI} = \alpha_S(1-\alpha_S)\partial\psi(1), \\ n^{-1}X_{SS}(0) &\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} \alpha_{SS} = \alpha_S^2\partial\psi(1). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We shall use the vector notation $\alpha = (\alpha_S, \alpha_{SI}, \alpha_{SS})$. The process X_I captures the number of infected individuals.

A3 $\sum_k k^3 p_k < \infty$.

Having laid down our technical assumptions, define for a real function f and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ the operator $\mathbb{D}^r$ as

$$\mathbb{D}^r f := f^{r-1}\frac{\partial^r f}{(\partial f)^r}, \tag{9}$$

where f^r is understood as $(r-1)$-times multiplication of f with itself for $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with the convention $f^0 := 1$ and whenever the division of $\partial^r f$ by $(\partial f)^r$ makes sense. Then, define $(x, \vartheta) := ((x_S, x_{SI}, x_{SS}), \vartheta)$, and $\kappa(\vartheta)$ as

$$\kappa(\vartheta) := \frac{\psi(\vartheta)\partial^2\psi(\vartheta)}{(\partial\psi(\vartheta))^2} = \mathbb{D}^2\psi(\vartheta). \tag{10}$$

Following Jacobsen et al. (2016), we interpret $\kappa(\vartheta)$ as the limiting ratio of the average excess degree of a susceptible node chosen randomly as a neighbour of an infectious individual, to the average degree of a susceptible node. Also define $\mathbb{H}(x, \vartheta) := (\mathbb{H}_x(x, \vartheta), \mathbb{H}_\vartheta(x, \vartheta))$ where $\mathbb{H}_x(x, \vartheta) := (\mathbb{H}_S(x_{SI}), \mathbb{H}_{SI}(x_{SI}, x_{SS}, \vartheta), \mathbb{H}_{SS}(x_{SI}, x_{SS}, \vartheta))$ and $\mathbb{H}_\vartheta(x_{SI}, \vartheta)$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_S(x_{SI}) &:= -\beta x_{SI}, \\ \mathbb{H}_{SI}(x_{SI}, x_{SS}, \vartheta) &:= \beta\kappa(\vartheta)\frac{x_{SI}}{x_S}(x_{SS} - x_{SI}) - \beta x_{SI}, \\ \mathbb{H}_{SS}(x_{SI}, x_{SS}, \vartheta) &:= -2\beta\kappa(\vartheta)\frac{x_{SI}x_{SS}}{x_S}, \\ \mathbb{H}_\vartheta(x_{SI}, \vartheta) &:= -\beta\frac{x_{SI}}{\alpha_S\partial\psi(\vartheta)}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Now, note that **A3** implies $\sum_k k^2 p_k < \infty$. Recall the strong law on large graphs due to Jacobsen et al. (2016).

THEOREM 1. *Assume **A1**,**A2**, and **A3** for a configuration model graph* $\mathcal{G}(\psi, n)$. *Then, for any* $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$, *the following holds*

$$\sup_{0<t\leq T} \|(X(t)/n, \theta(t)) - (x, \vartheta)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0,$$

where $(x, \vartheta) \coloneqq ((x_S, x_{SI}, x_{SS}), \vartheta)$ *is the solution of*

$$(x(t), \vartheta(t)) = (x(0), \vartheta(0)) + \int_0^t \mathbb{H}(x(s), \vartheta(s))\, ds,$$

with the initial condition $x(0) = \alpha$ *and* $\vartheta(0) = 1$.

PROOF. Observe that in the absence of recovery, the numbers of susceptible and infected individuals are linearly related as $X_S + X_I = n$ in the standard SIR model. The proof therefore follows immediately by setting the recovery rate in the SIR model to zero and assuming that there is only one layer in Jacobsen et al. (2016). □

3. Functional Central Limit Theorem. In this section, we derive a functional central limit theorem for X after an appropriate scaling. Recall that

$$X(t) = X(0) + \int_0^t \mathbb{F}_X(X(s))\, ds + M'(t),$$

where $M'(t) \coloneqq (M'_S(t), M'_{SI}(t), M'_{SS}(t))$ is a zero-mean martingale. Define

$$M(t) = (M_S(t), M_{SI}(t), M_{SS}(t)) \coloneqq n^{-1/2} M'(t).$$

We study the quadratic variation of the scaled martingale $M(t)$. The idea is to check whether either the optional or the predictable quadratic variation of the scaled process M converges in probability to a deterministic limit. If either of them does, and if the paths of M become approximately continuous in the limit ("big" jumps disappear), we can make use of the the *Rebolledo's theorem* (Rebolledo, 1980; Helland, 1982) on M to establish the asymptotic limit.

Note that $M(t)$ is square integrable. For each $\epsilon > 0$, define

$$M^\epsilon(t) \coloneqq (M^\epsilon_S(t), M^\epsilon_{SI}(t), M^\epsilon_{SS}(t)) \tag{12}$$

to be a vector of square integrable martingales containing all jumps of $M(t)$ larger in absolute value than ϵ. In keeping with Equation (2) and following Karatzas and Shreve (1991, Chapter 1), we define

$$\mathcal{F}_{t-} \coloneqq \sigma(\cup_{s\in[0,t)} \mathcal{F}_s),$$

the σ-field of events strictly prior to $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. We write $\mathcal{F}_{0-} := \mathcal{F}_0$, by convention.

We use the shorthand notation $\langle M \rangle(t)$ for the 3×3 matrix of predictable covariation processes of the components of $M(t)$. That is,

$$\langle M \rangle(t) := \begin{pmatrix} \langle M_S \rangle(t) & \langle M_S, M_{SI} \rangle(t) & \langle M_S, M_{SS} \rangle(t) \\ \langle M_{SI}, M_S \rangle(t) & \langle M_{SI} \rangle(t) & \langle M_{SI}, M_{SS} \rangle(t) \\ \langle M_{SS}, M_S \rangle(t) & \langle M_{SS}, M_{SI} \rangle(t) & \langle M_{SS} \rangle(t) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

Here $\langle M_S \rangle(t) := \langle M_S, M_S \rangle(t)$ etc., by convention. For the sake of brevity, we shall often omit the time t when it is unambiguous. We also define $\langle M^\epsilon \rangle$ similarly. We shall study the asymptotic limits of $\langle M \rangle(t)$ and $\langle M^\epsilon \rangle(t)$ as $n \to \infty$ for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$. For this purpose, we need the neighbourhood distribution of a susceptible node i of degree k, *i.e.*, the distribution of $(X_{SI,i}, X_{SS,i})$ for a node $i \in S_k$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Dynamic construction of the graph. We make use of the dynamic graph construction method to derive the necessary probability distribution conditional on the history of the process. In this equivalent construction[5] (Jacobsen et al., 2016; Decreusefond et al., 2012; Janson, Luczak and Windridge, 2014), the graph is dynamically revealed as infections take place. Accordingly, a susceptible node $i \in S_k$ remains unpaired until it becomes infected. We could, however, pair off all unpaired edges at time $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (uniformly at random according to the CM construction) in order to define the neighbourhood of i. Therefore, the neighbourhood of a susceptible node arises solely out of uniform matching of half-edges. As a consequence, we obtain a hypergeometric distribution (see also Jacobsen et al. (2016)).

REMARK 1. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in S_k$, conditionally on the process history upto time $t > 0$, the vector $(X_{SI,i}, X_{SS,i})$ follows a hypergeometric distribution given by

$$\mathrm{P}(X_{SI,i} = n_{SI}, X_{SS,i} = n_{SS}) = \frac{\binom{X_{SI}}{n_{SI}} \binom{X_{S\bullet} - X_{SI}}{n_{SS}}}{\binom{X_S}{k}}, \tag{14}$$

supported on $n_{SI} + n_{SS} = k$ where $n_{SI}, n_{SS} \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

We quote another important remark from Jacobsen et al. (2016) that would come in handy for the derivations.

[5]This construction is equivalent in the sense that all the quantities of importance such as the number of susceptible nodes at time $t \geq 0$ follow the same probability law as if the random multigraph was revealed first (according to uniform matching/pairing procedure of the configuration model) and then susceptible-infected epidemic process was run on it.

REMARK 2. Let $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n$ denote the degrees of the graph. The random variables $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n$ have probability generating function ψ given in Equation 1 and satisfy **A3**. Note that the total number of edges in the graph is $2^{-1}\sum_i d_i$. It immediately follows that $n^{-1}X_{SI} \leq n^{-1}X_{S\bullet} \leq 2\partial\psi(1)$ and $n^{-1}X_{SS} \leq n^{-1}X_{S\bullet} \leq 2\partial\psi(1)$ for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Also note that θ is a fractional quantity and therefore, $\alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta) \leq \partial\psi(1)$. By virtue of **A1**, $n^{-1}X_{S\bullet}$ is bounded away from 0 on $\mathcal{T}$ and hence, so is θ. As a consequence of Jacobsen et al. (2016, Lemma 1(b)), we can take the same lower bound for $\alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta)$. Let us denote by $\xi \in \mathbb{R}_+$ the uniform lower bound for $n^{-1}X_{S\bullet}$ and $\alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta)$ so that we can write $n^{-1}X_{S\bullet} \in [\xi, 2\psi(1)] \subset \mathbb{R}_+$.

3.1. *Deterministic Limit of* $\langle M\rangle(t)$. Recall $(x, \vartheta) \coloneqq ((x_S, x_{SI}, x_{SS}), \vartheta)$. Let us begin by defining the following operators in terms of (x, ϑ),

$$
\begin{aligned}
v_S &\coloneqq \beta x_{SI},\\
v_{SI} &\coloneqq \beta\Big(\frac{x_{SI}(x_{SS}-x_{SI})^2}{x_S^2}\mathbb{D}^3\psi(\vartheta)\\
&\qquad - \frac{x_{SI}(x_{SS}-3x_{SI})}{x_S}\mathbb{D}^2\psi(\vartheta) + x_{SI}\Big),\\
v_{SS} &\coloneqq 4\beta\frac{x_{SI}x_{SS}}{x_S}\Big(\frac{x_{SS}}{x_S}\mathbb{D}^3\psi(\vartheta) + \mathbb{D}^2\psi(\vartheta)\Big),\\
v_{S,SI} &\coloneqq -\beta\Big(\frac{x_{SI}(x_{SS}-x_{SI})}{x_S}\mathbb{D}^2\psi(\vartheta) - x_{SI}\Big),\\
v_{S,SS} &\coloneqq 2\beta\frac{x_{SI}x_{SS}}{x_S}\mathbb{D}^2\psi(\vartheta),\\
v_{SI,SS} &\coloneqq -2\beta\frac{x_{SI}x_{SS}(x_{SS}-x_{SI})}{x_S^2}\mathbb{D}^3\psi(\vartheta).
\end{aligned}
\tag{15}
$$

Now, define a $\mathcal{T}_0$-indexed family of matrices $\{V(t)\}$ as follows

$$
V(t) \coloneqq \begin{pmatrix} V_S(t) & V_{S,SI}(t) & V_{S,SS}(t)\\ V_{SI,S}(t) & V_{SI}(t) & V_{SI,SS}(t)\\ V_{SS,S}(t) & V_{SS,SI}(t) & V_{SS}(t)\end{pmatrix},
\tag{16}
$$

where, given $v_{id_1,id_2}(x, \vartheta)$ for $id_1, id_2 \in \{S, SI, SS\}$ in Equation (15),

$$
V_{id_1,id_2}(t) \coloneqq \int_0^t v_{id_1,id_2}(x(s), \vartheta(s))\, ds,
\tag{17}
$$

with the convention $v_{id_1,id_2} \coloneqq v_{id_2,id_1}$ for $id_1, id_2 \in \{S, SI, SS\}$ and $v_{id_1,id_2} \coloneqq v_{id_1}$ whenever $id_1 = id_2 \in \{S, SI, SS\}$. Note that this also sets the convention

$V_{id_1,id_2}(t) \coloneqq V_{id_2,id_1}(t)$ for $id_1, id_2 \in \{S, SI, SS\}$ and $V_{id_1,id_2}(t) \coloneqq V_{id_1}(t)$ whenever $id_1 = id_2 \in \{S, SI, SS\}$ for each $t \in \mathcal{T}_0$.

Let us now present our first result providing the deterministic limit of $\langle M \rangle$ in the following lemma. The key strategy in proving these deterministic limits will be to approximate various hypergeometric moments by the corresponding multinomial ones as $n \to \infty$.

LEMMA 1. *Consider the stochastic SI model described in Section 1.5. Assume **A1**, **A2** and **A3** for a configuration model graph $\mathcal{G}(\psi, n)$. Then, for each $t \in \mathcal{T}_0$,*

$$\langle M \rangle(t) \xrightarrow{P} V(t), \tag{18}$$

as $n \to \infty$ where $V(t)$ is as defined in Equation (16) and (x, ϑ) is the solution of

$$(x(t), \vartheta(t)) = (x(0), \vartheta(0)) + \int_0^t \mathbb{H}(x(s), \vartheta(s))\, ds,$$

with initial condition $x(0) = \alpha$ and $\vartheta(0) = 1$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 1. To show convergence of the matrix random process $\langle M \rangle(t)$ to $V(t)$, we show element-wise convergence of respective components. The general strategy to prove convergence for these components remains the same. To save the reader from repetitive lines of argument, we only demonstrate here the strategy for establishing $M_{SI}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} V_{SI}(t)$. Remaining assertions follow similarly and are outlined in Appendix B for the sake of completeness.

Computation of $\langle M_{SI} \rangle$. Let us first study the quadratic variation of M_{SI}. Recall that

$$M'_{SI}(t) = X_{SI}(t) - X_{SI}(0) - \beta \int_0^t \sum_{i \in S} X_{SI,i}(s)(X_{SS,i}(s) - X_{SI,i}(s))\, ds.$$

Note that M'_{SI} is a pure jump, càdlàg, zero mean martingale process. The process M'_{SI} jumps only if infection of a node occurs at time s. Let us denote the jump sizes of M'_{SI} by $\delta M'_{SI}$. We now look at the predictable quadratic

variation of the process.

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle M'_{SI}\rangle(t) &= \int_0^t \mathrm{E}[(\delta M'_{SI}(s))^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
\implies \langle M_{SI}\rangle(t) = \langle n^{-1/2} M'_{SI}\rangle(t) &= \frac{1}{n}\int_0^t \mathrm{E}[(\delta M'_{SI}(s))^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\int_0^t \sum_{i\in S} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2\, ds \\
&= \int_0^t \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i\in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2\, ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, for a randomly selected $i \in S_k$, we seek to find the (conditional) moments $\mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2]$. Following the computations in Appendix A, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2] &= \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i})_2] - 2\mathrm{E}[(X_{SI,i})_2 X_{SS,i}] \\
&\quad - \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}X_{SS,i}] + \mathrm{E}[X^3_{SI,i}] \\
&= \frac{(k)_3 X_{SI}(X_{SS})_2}{(X_{S\bullet})_3} - 2\frac{(k)_3 (X_{SI})_2 X_{SS}}{(X_{S\bullet})_3} \\
&\quad - \frac{(k)_2 X_{SI} X_{SS}}{(X_{S\bullet})_2} + \frac{(k)_3 (X_{SI})_3}{(X_{S\bullet})_3} \\
&\quad + 3\frac{(k)_2 (X_{SI})_2}{(X_{S\bullet})_2} + k\frac{X_{SI}}{X_{S\bullet}} \\
&= \frac{(k)_3 X_{SI}}{(X_{S\bullet})_3}[(X_{SS})_2 - 2(X_{SI}-1)X_{SS} \\
&\quad + (X_{SI}-1)(X_{SI}-2)] \\
&\quad - \frac{(k)_2 X_{SI}}{(X_{S\bullet})_2}[X_{SS} - 3(X_{SI}-1)] + k\frac{X_{SI}}{X_{S\bullet}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We would like to bring to our readers' attention that the expectation above, like the distribution in Remark 1, is conditional on the process history. Define the compensator $C^k_h : \mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ as $C^k_h(t) \coloneqq \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}(t)(X_{SS,i}(t) - X_{SI,i}(t))^2]$. We wish to approximate the hypergeometric moments by corresponding multinomial ones in the limit. To do so, let us define the corresponding

multinomial compensator $C_m^k : \mathcal{T} \times [\xi, 2\partial\psi(1)] \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} C_m^k(t, z(t)) &\coloneqq \frac{(k)_3 n^{-3} X_{SI}}{z^3(t)} [{X_{SS}}^2 - 2X_{SI}X_{SS} + X_{SI}^2] \\ &\quad - \frac{(k)_2 n^{-2} X_{SI}}{z^2(t)} [X_{SS} - 3X_{SI}] + kn^{-1} \frac{X_{SI}}{z(t)} \\ &= \frac{(k)_3 n^{-3} X_{SI}}{z^3(t)} (X_{SS} - X_{SI})^2 - \frac{(k)_2 n^{-2} X_{SI}}{z^2(t)} [X_{SS} - 3X_{SI}] \\ &\quad + kn^{-1} \frac{X_{SI}}{z(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Please observe that there exists an $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$C_m^k(t, z(t)) \leq Lk^3, \tag{19}$$

uniformly in n. This holds because $n^{-1}X_{SI}$ and $n^{-1}X_{SS}$ are uniformly bounded above by virtue of Remark 2 and z is bounded away from zero, by definition. The function $C_m^k(t, z(t))$ is also Lipschitz continuous in z.

Now recall the definition of v from Equation (15) and define

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(t) &\coloneqq \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(t)(X_{SS,i}(t) - X_{SI,i}(t))^2 - v_{SI}(x(t), \vartheta(t)) \\ &= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(t)(X_{SS,i}(t) - X_{SI,i}(t))^2 - v_{SI}(n^{-1}X(t), \theta(t)) \\ &\quad + v_{SI}(n^{-1}X(t), \theta(t)) - v_{SI}(x(t), \vartheta(t)) \\ &= \Delta_1(t) + \Delta_2(t), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Delta_1(t) \coloneqq \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(t)(X_{SS,i}(t) - X_{SI,i}(t))^2 - v_{SI}(n^{-1}X(t), \theta(t)),$$

and $\Delta_2(t) \coloneqq v_{SI}(n^{-1}X(t), \theta(t)) - v_{SI}(x(t), \vartheta(t))$.

Note that to show $\langle M_{SI} \rangle \xrightarrow{\text{P}} V_{SI}$, it suffices to show $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$. We aim to achieve this by separately showing $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_1(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$ and $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_2(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$.

Convergence of $\Delta_1(t)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_1(t) &= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2 - v_{SI}(n^{-1}X, \theta) \\
&= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2 \\
&\quad - \beta[\frac{n^{-3}X_{SI}(X_{SS} - X_{SI})^2}{\alpha_S^2} \frac{\partial^3 \psi(\theta)}{(\partial \psi(\theta))^3} \\
&\quad - \frac{n^{-2}X_{SI}(X_{SS} - 3X_{SI})}{\alpha_S} \frac{\partial^2 \psi(\theta)}{(\partial \psi(\theta))^2} + n^{-1}X_{SI}] \\
&= \sum_k [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2 \\
&\quad - \beta\{\frac{n^{-3}X_{SI}(X_{SS} - X_{SI})^2}{\alpha_S^2} \frac{(k)_3 \theta^k p_k}{(\theta \partial \psi(\theta))^3} \\
&\quad - \frac{n^{-2}X_{SI}(X_{SS} - 3X_{SI})}{\alpha_S} \frac{(k)_2 \theta^k p_k}{(\theta \partial \psi(\theta))^2} + n^{-1}X_{SI} \frac{k \theta p_k}{\theta \partial \psi(\theta)}\}] \\
&= \sum_k [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2 \\
&\quad - \beta \alpha_S p_k \theta^k \{\frac{(k)_3 n^{-3} X_{SI}(X_{SS} - X_{SI})^2}{(\alpha_S \theta \partial \psi(\theta))^3} \\
&\quad - \frac{(k)_2 n^{-2} X_{SI}(X_{SS} - 3X_{SI})}{(\alpha_S \theta \partial \psi(\theta))^2} + \frac{k n^{-1} X_{SI}}{\alpha_S \theta \partial \psi(\theta)}\}] \\
&= \sum_k [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2 - \beta \alpha_S p_k \theta^k C_m^k(t, \alpha_S \theta \partial \psi(\theta))].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we define

$$\Delta_1^{(k)}(t) \coloneqq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2 - \beta \alpha_S p_k \theta^k C_m^k(t, \alpha_S \theta \partial \psi(\theta)).$$

Observe that $\Delta_1(t) = \sum_k \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)$. Therefore our task boils down to showing that $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\sum_k \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0$ as $n \to \infty$. We achieve this task in two steps. First we show that the tails of $\sum_k \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)$ are negligible. Second, we show that each term $\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)$ converges to zero uniformly in probability for a fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(Step I) Tails are negligible. Let us begin by showing that as $N \to \infty$,

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0} |\sum_{k>N} \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k>N}\sum_{i\in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2| &\leq \beta\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k>N}\sum_{i\in S_k} k^3 \\ &\leq \beta\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k>N} k^3 X_{S_k} \\ &\leq 2\beta\sum_{k>N} k^3 p_k, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

because $n^{-1}X_{S_k} \leq 2p_k$ for sufficiently large n in the light of Remark 2. Again, following Remark 2 and the bound on C_m^k from Equation (19), we get

$$|\sum_{k>N} \beta\alpha_S p_k \theta^k C_m^k(t, \alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta))| \leq \beta L \sum_{k>N} k^3 p_k. \tag{21}$$

Combining inequalities (20) and (21) in view of **A3**,

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0} |\sum_{k>N} \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0.$$

(Step II) Uniform convergence in probability for a fixed k. In addition to Step I, it is sufficient to show $\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$ for an arbitrarily fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$ to justify $\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_1(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| &= |\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2 - \beta\alpha_S p_k\theta^k C_m^k(t, \alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta))| \\ &\leq \beta n^{-1}|\sum_{i\in S_k} X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2 - X_{S_k}C_h^k(t)| && (22) \\ &\quad + \beta n^{-1} X_{S_k}|C_h^k(t) - C_m^k(t, n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})| && (23) \\ &\quad + \beta|n^{-1}X_{S_k}C_m^k(t, n^{-1}X_{S\bullet}) - \alpha_S p_k\theta^k C_m^k(t, n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})| && (24) \\ &\quad + \beta\alpha_S p_k\theta^k|C_m^k(t, n^{-1}X_{S\bullet}) - C_m^k(t, \alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta))|, && (25) \end{aligned}$$

and we intend to show that each of the above summands converges uniformly in probability to zero.

Define the process $\Delta^{(k)}_{1,1}(t) := \sum_{i\in S_k} X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})^2 - X_{S_k}C^k_h(t)$. Observe that $\Delta^{(k)}_{1,1}(t)$ is a zero-mean, piecewise-constant, càdlàg martingale with paths in D. The jumps of $\Delta^{(k)}_{1,1}(t)$ take place when a node of degree-k gets infected. The quadratic variation of $\Delta^{(k)}_{1,1}(t)$ is expressed as the sum of its squared jumps and is therefore given by

$$[\Delta^{(k)}_{1,1}](t) = \sum_{s\le t}(\delta\Delta^{(k)}_{1,1}(s))^2 \le k^6 n,$$

because the number of jumps can not exceed n, the number of nodes in the graph. Therefore by Doob's martingale inequality we get

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0} |n^{-1}\Delta^{(k)}_{1,1}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0,$$

since $\text{E}[[\Delta^{(k)}_{1,1}](t)] = \text{E}[(\Delta^{(k)}_{1,1}(t))^2] = O(n)$. That is, the quantity in (22) converges uniformly in probability to zero.

For the term in (23), take into account $n^{-1}X_{S_k} \le 1$ and see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0} |C^k_h(t) - C^k_m(t, n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})| = \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0} | & \frac{(k)_3 X_{SI}}{(X_{S\bullet})_3}[(X_{SS})_2 - 2(X_{SI}-1)X_{SS} \\
& + (X_{SI}-1)(X_{SI}-2)] \\
& - \frac{(k)_2 X_{SI}}{(X_{S\bullet})_2}[X_{SS} - 3(X_{SI}-1)] + k\frac{X_{SI}}{X_{S\bullet}} \\
& - \{\frac{(k)_3 n^{-3} X_{SI}}{(n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})^3}(X_{SS} - X_{SI})^2 \\
& - \frac{(k)_2 n^{-2} X_{SI}}{(n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})^2}[X_{SS} - 3X_{SI}] \\
& + kn^{-1}\frac{X_{SI}}{(n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})}\}| \\
\le & \frac{c_1 k^3}{X_{S\bullet}(T) - 2},
\end{aligned}$$

for some $c_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, because $X_{S\bullet}$ is non-increasing on $\mathcal{T} = [0, T]$. Therefore, by **A1**, the quantity in (23) converges to zero uniformly in probability.

Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0} |n^{-1}X_{S_k}C^k_m(t, n^{-1}X_{S\bullet}) - \alpha_S p_k \theta^k C^k_m(t, n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})| \\
&\qquad\qquad \le Lk^3 \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0} |n^{-1}X_{S_k} - \alpha_S p_k \theta^k| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by virtue of the bound on C_m^k in Equation (19) and (Jacobsen et al., 2016, Lemma 1(a)). Therefore, the term in (24) also converges to zero uniformly in probability.

Finally by virtue of Lipschitz continuity of $C_m^k(t,z)$ in z, we get

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|C_m^k(t,n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})-C_m^k(t,\alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta))|\leq c_2\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|n^{-1}X_{S\bullet}-\alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta)|\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}0,$$

for some $c_2\in\mathbb{R}_+$ and because $\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|n^{-1}X_{S\bullet}-\alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta)|\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}0$ as shown in Jacobsen et al. (2016). Thus we show that the term in (25) converges to zero uniformly in probability.

Having shown the terms in (22), (23), (24) and (25) converge to zero uniformly in probability, we establish that

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)|\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}0,$$

uniformly in probability for any fixed $k\in\mathbb{N}$. Finally, by virtue of Step I and Step II, we obtain

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\Delta_1(t)|\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}0. \tag{26}$$

Convergence of $\Delta_2(t)$. Note that $v_{SI}(n^{-1}X,\theta)$ is Lipschitz continuous on its domain that we can take as $(0,1]\times[\xi,2\partial\psi(1)]^2\times[\xi,1]$, by Remark 2. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|v_{SI}(n^{-1}X(t),\theta(t))-v_{SI}(x(t),\vartheta(t))|\\&\leq c_3\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}\big\|(n^{-1}X(t),\theta(t))-(x(t),\vartheta(t))\big\|,\end{aligned}$$

for some Lipschitz constant $c_3\in\mathbb{R}_+$. Since (x,ϑ) is the solution of

$$(x(t),\vartheta(t))=(x(0),\vartheta(0))+\int_0^t\mathbb{H}(x(s),\vartheta(s))\,ds,$$

with initial condition $x(0)=\alpha$ and $\vartheta(0)=1$, we get by virtue of Theorem 1,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}\big\|(n^{-1}X,\theta)-(x,\vartheta)\big\|\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}0\\\implies&\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|v_{SI}(n^{-1}X,\theta)-v_{SI}(x,\vartheta)|\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}0\\\implies&\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\Delta_2(t)|\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}}0.\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Final Conclusion. Finally in view of (26) and (27), we conclude

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\Delta(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0, \tag{28}$$

which is a sufficient condition for

$$\int_0^t \sum_k \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i}-X_{SI,i})^2\,ds \xrightarrow{\text{P}} \int_0^t v_{SI}(x(s),\vartheta(s))\,ds$$
$$\implies \langle M_{SI}\rangle(t) \xrightarrow{\text{P}} V_{SI}(t) := \int_0^t v_{SI}(x(s),\vartheta(s))\,ds.$$

Other components of $\langle M\rangle$ can similarly be shown to converge in probability to respective components of V. Please refer to Appendix B for further details.

□

3.2. *Asymptotic Rarefaction of Jumps.* Recall that

$$M^\epsilon(t) := (M_S^\epsilon(t), M_{SI}^\epsilon(t), M_{SS}^\epsilon(t))$$

is the vector of square integrable martingales containing all jumps of components of $M(t)$ larger than ϵ in absolute value, for $\epsilon > 0$, *i.e.*, $M_{id}(t) - M_{id}^\epsilon(t)$ is a local square integrable martingale and $|\delta M_{id}(t) - \delta M_{id}^\epsilon(t)| \le \epsilon$ for all $id \in \{S, SI, SS\}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}_0$. We wish to show $\langle M_{id}^\epsilon\rangle(t) \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$ for all $id \in \{S, SI, SS\}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}_0$ as $n \to \infty$. We would like to point out to our readers that this condition is essentially the *strong Asymptotic Rarefaction of Jumps Condition of the second type* (strong ARJ(2)) as described in Rebolledo (1980); Andersen et al. (1993). Intuitively this ensures that the sample paths of the martingale $M(t)$ are close to continuous in the limit. Before proceeding further, we offer the following remark.

Remark 3. For the configuration model graph $\mathcal{G}(\psi, n)$ along with **A3**, the following holds true:

$$n^{-\frac{1}{2}} d_{max} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0, \tag{29}$$

where d_{max} is the maximum degree observed in a realisation of $\mathcal{G}(\psi, n)$.

Proof of Remark 3. The result follows by a direct application of the result in Barndorff-Nielsen (1963, Theorem 5.2) along with **A3**.

□

Now let us compute the predictable quadratic variation of M^ϵ and establish its asymptotic limit.

LEMMA 2. *Consider the stochastic SI model described in Section 1.5. Assume **A1**,**A2** and **A3** for a configuration model graph $\mathcal{G}(\psi, n)$. Consider the vector M^ϵ of square integrable martingales containing all jumps of components of $M(t)$ larger than ϵ in absolute value for $\epsilon > 0$, as defined in Equation (12). Then, for each $t \in \mathcal{T}_0$,*

$$\langle M^\epsilon_{id} \rangle(t) \xrightarrow{P} 0, \tag{30}$$

as $n \to \infty$ for all $id \in \{S, SI, SS\}$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 2. We proceed in the following two steps.

Computation of $\langle M^\epsilon_S \rangle$. Note that the original process M'_S makes only unit jumps. Then, for arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle M^\epsilon_S \rangle(t) &= \int_0^t \mathrm{Var}[\delta M^\epsilon_S(s) \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
&\leq \int_0^t \mathrm{E}[(\delta M^\epsilon_S(s))^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
&= \int_0^t \mathrm{E}[(\delta M^\epsilon_S(s))^2 \mathbb{1}(|\delta M_S(s)| > \epsilon) \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
&= \int_0^t \mathrm{E}[(\delta M^\epsilon_S(s))^2 \mathbb{1}(|\delta M'_S(s)| > n^{1/2}\epsilon) \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
&= 0 \text{ for all } n > \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \\
\implies \langle M^\epsilon_S \rangle(t) &\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0 \text{ for all } 0 < t \leq T \text{ and for all } \epsilon > 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Computation of $\langle M^\epsilon_{SI} \rangle$ and $\langle M^\epsilon_{SS} \rangle$. Note that both M'_{SI} and M'_{SS} are pure jump, zero mean, càdlàg martingale processes. The processes M'_{SI} and M'_{SS} jump only if infection of a node occurs at time s. This in particular implies that the jump sizes of M'_{SI} and M'_{SS} are bounded above by the degree of the node getting infected. Therefore, they are also bounded above by the

maximum degree d_{max}. For an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, and for $id \in \{SI, SS\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle M^{\epsilon}_{id} \rangle(t) &= \int_0^t \mathrm{Var}[\delta M^{\epsilon}_{id}(s) \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
&\leq \int_0^t \mathrm{E}[(\delta M^{\epsilon}_{id}(s))^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
&= \int_0^t \mathrm{E}[(\delta M^{\epsilon}_{id}(s))^2 \mathbb{1}(|\delta M_{id}(s)| > \epsilon) \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
&\leq \int_0^t \mathrm{E}[(\delta M^{\epsilon}_{id}(s))^2 \mathbb{1}(|n^{-1/2} d_{max}| > \epsilon) \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
&\leq t n^{-1} d^2_{max} \mathbb{1}(|n^{-1/2} d_{max}| > \epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by Remark 3, and the continuous mapping theorem as well as standard properties of almost sure convergence and convergence in probability, the right hand side of the above inequality $t n^{-1} d^2_{max} \mathbb{1}(|n^{-1/2} d_{max}| > \epsilon) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0$ for each $0 < t \leq T$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathrm{P}(\langle M^{\epsilon}_{id} \rangle(t) > \delta) \leq \mathrm{P}(t n^{-1} d^2_{max} \mathbb{1}(|n^{-1/2} d_{max}| > \epsilon) > \delta) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

establishing $\langle M^{\epsilon}_{id} \rangle(t) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for all $0 < t \leq T$ and $\epsilon > 0$. This completes the proof.

□

3.3. *Statement and Proof of FCLT.* Having shown the convergence of all relevant quadratic variation processes, we are now ready to present the following functional central limit theorem. First we state that the function V found in Lemma 1 is a positive semidefinite (psd) matrix-valued function on $\mathcal{T}_0$, with positive semidefinite increments. Set $V(0) \coloneqq \mathbf{0}$, the 3×3 null matrix, so that we can treat $V(t)$ as a psd matrix-valued function on the entirety of $\mathcal{T}$. Let us denote the collection of all such psd 3×3 matrix-valued functions on $\mathcal{T}$ that has psd increments and that is $\mathbf{0}$ at time zero by $\mathcal{V}$. Given such a matrix-valued function $V \in \mathcal{V}$, let G be a continuous Gaussian vector martingale such that $\langle G \rangle = [G] = V$. [6] In particular, $G(t) - G(s) \sim N(\mathbf{0}, V(t) - V(s))$, the multivariate normal distribution for $0 \leq s \leq t$.

THEOREM 2. (Functional Central Limit Theorem). *Consider the stochastic SI model described in Section 1.5. Assume **A1**, **A2** and **A3** for a config-*

[6] Such a process always exists (Andersen et al., 1993, Chapter II, p. 83).

uration model graph $\mathcal{G}(\psi, n)$. Consider, for $t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$M(t) \coloneqq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(X(t) - X(0) - \int_0^t \mathbb{F}_X(X(s))\, ds), \tag{31}$$

where $\mathbb{F}_X(.)$ is as defined in Equation (3). Then, there exists a matrix-valued function $V \in \mathcal{V}$ on $\mathcal{T}$ such that

$$M \overset{\mathcal{D}}{\Longrightarrow} G \text{ in } D^{(3)} \text{ as } n \to \infty, \tag{32}$$

where G is a continuous Gaussian vector martingale such that $\langle G \rangle = [G] = V$, and $\langle M \rangle$ and $[M]$ converge uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathcal{T}$, in probability, to V.

Here $D^{(3)}$ is the usual Skorohod space of $\mathbb{R}^3$-valued càdlàg functions on $\mathcal{T}$ endowed with the Skorohod topology and $\overset{\mathcal{D}}{\Longrightarrow}$ stands for weak convergence in the sense of Billingsley (1999). Now we present the proof of the above theorem.

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $\mathcal{T}_0 \coloneqq (0, T] \subset \mathcal{T}$. We wish to apply Rebolledo's functional central limit theorem for local martingales on M. Please refer to Rebolledo (1980) for the original version of the theorem and (Andersen et al., 1993, Chapter II, p. 83) for a version tailored to locally square integrable martingales. Please note that in the light of Doob-Meyer decomposition given in Equation (3), M is indeed a pure jump, zero-mean, locally square integrable, càdlàg martingale. It suffices to carry out the following two steps.

(Step I) Deterministic Limit of $\langle M \rangle$. Let (x, ϑ) be the solution of

$$(x(t), \vartheta(t)) = (x(0), \vartheta(0)) + \int_0^t \mathbb{H}(x(s), \vartheta(s))\, ds,$$

with initial condition $x(0) = \alpha$ and $\vartheta(0) = 1$, as given in Theorem 1. Given (x, ϑ), define the 3×3 matrix-valued function V on $\mathcal{T}_0$ as shown in Equation (16) by means of deterministic functions v_{id_1,id_2} for $id_1, id_2 \in \{S, SI, SS\}$ described in Equation (15). Set $V(0) \coloneqq \mathbf{0}$, the 3×3 null matrix, so that V is defined on the entirety of $\mathcal{T}$. Then, by virtue of Lemma 1, we conclude, for each $t \in \mathcal{T}_0$,

$$\langle M \rangle(t) \xrightarrow{\text{P}} V(t),$$

as $n \to \infty$.

(Step II) Asymptotic Rarefaction of Jumps. Let $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be arbitrary. Consider the vector M^ϵ of square integrable martingales containing all jumps of components of $M(t)$ larger than ϵ in absolute value for $\epsilon > 0$, as defined in Equation (12). Then, by means of Lemma 2, we conclude

$$\langle M^\epsilon_{id} \rangle(t) \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0,$$

for each $t \in \mathcal{T}_0$ and $id \in \{S, SI, SS\}$, as $n \to \infty$.

Now let G be the continuous Gaussian vector martingale such that $\langle G \rangle = [G] = V$. In the light of Rebolledo's theorem for locally square integrable martingales (Andersen et al., 1993, Chapter II, p. 83), Step I and Step II are sufficient to establish

$$(M(t_1), M(t_2), \ldots, M(t_l)) \overset{\mathcal{D}}{\Longrightarrow} (G(t_1), G(t_2), \ldots, G(t_l)) \text{ as } n \to \infty \tag{33}$$

for all $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_l \in \mathcal{T}_0$. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{T}_0$ is dense in $\mathcal{T}$, we conclude

$$M \overset{\mathcal{D}}{\Longrightarrow} G \text{ in } D^{(3)} \text{ as } n \to \infty, \tag{34}$$

and $\langle M \rangle$ and $[M]$ converge uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathcal{T}$, in probability, to V. This completes the proof.

□

4. Applications. We consider two specific applications of our result, namely, in percolation theory and in computer science in the context of spread of computer viruses. As we discuss these two topics, we shall also present some numerical and simulation results that are intended not only to provide insights into the dynamics of the process, but also to serve as a verification of our results.

4.1. *Percolation.* There is a connection between the stochastic SI model and percolation theory from statistical physics. It is the study of a liquid filtering ("percolating") through a porous medium. Classical equilibrium-mechanics studies its stationary behaviour and premises upon the axiom that the underlying quantum-mechanical laws are designed so as to maximise the entropy. Stationary distribution of such a stochastic system is given by the Boltzmann ensemble (Stauffer and Aharony (1992)). This classical treatment of the subject, however, does not explain the non-equilibrium behaviour of the dynamical system, *i.e.*, when it is still in a transient phase. Consequently the non-equilibrium behaviour of percolation has aroused much interest in recent times. Some notable contributions include Hinrichsen (2006); Barato and Hinrichsen (2011, 2009); Linder et al. (2008). Standard treatment of



Fig 2: Comparison of percolation profiles of three degree distributions having the same mean. **(Left)** Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda = 6$. **(Middle)** A heterogeneous population with degree distribution $p_k := 0.7 \times \mathbb{1}(k = 1) + 0.2 \times \mathbb{1}(k = 4) + 0.1 \times \mathbb{1}(k = 45)$. Such a degree distribution represents a population segregated into three classes. Weak nodes constitute the biggest class, followed by medium strength nodes and then strong nodes. **(Right)** Negative Binomial distribution with parameters $r = 2, p = 3/4$. The figures show time evolution of the fraction of nodes on the percolated component for varying infection rates β. We assume the initial fraction of infected nodes is 0.1 in all three cases. The yellow region in each of the plots corresponds to the terminal state. Questions such as whether the system with an infection rate β "percolates" are immediately settled by drawing a horizontal line and checking whether the lines passes through the colour corresponding to a pre-specified level.



(a) Simulation setting: Poisson distribution with $\lambda = 5, \alpha_S = 0.9$, and $\beta = 0.5$.



(b) Simulation setting: r-regular random graph with $r = 3, \alpha_S = 0.9$, and $\beta = 0.5$.

Fig 3: Comparison of our diffusion approximation with simulation results obtained by Gillespie's algorithm.

percolation, both equilibrium and non-equilibrium, has been extended in another important direction concerning the structure of the porous medium. Traditionally it has been studied on lattices and grids. Of late, however, percolation on random graphs has also been considered (Baroni, van der Hofstad and Komjathy (2015); Bhamidi, van der Hofstad and Hooghiemstra (2012); Callaway et al. (2000); van der Hofstad (2010)). Continuing in this direction, we shall treat (non-equilibrium) percolation as a dynamical process on a configuration model random graph and study its behaviour over a *finite* time interval $\mathcal{T}$.

One of the key quantities of interest in the study of non-equilibrium percolation is the time evolution of the number of wetted sites.[7] The correspondence of our stochastic SI model as described in Section 1.5 to non-equilibrium percolation is visible if we treat the infected nodes as the ones wetted during the process of percolation. Accordingly, in this context, we give the process $X(t) \coloneqq (X_S(t), X_{SI}(t), X_{SS}(t))$ appropriate new interpretation. The process $X_S(t)$, for example, captures the number of unwetted sites until time t, and the process X_{SI}, the number of channels (bonds) through which the liquid can percolate. In Figure 1, the percolated component up to a given time (the wetted part of the graph) is shown in red. Having made the correspondence precise, we can apply Theorem 2 to approximate these quantities in the large graph limit.

Numerical Illustration. In Figure 3, we show some simulation results to check the accuracy of our scaling limit. We compare the expected sample paths of X_S and X_{SI} provided by Theorems 1 and 2, with estimates obtained using simulations of the Gillespie's algorithm on a CM graph. In particular, we considered a Poisson degree distribution in Figure 3a and a 3-regular random graph in Figure 3b (obtained by the CM construction with degree distribution $p_k = \mathbb{1}(k = 3)$). In Figure 4, we show the time evolution of the correlation coefficient between the jumps of X_S and X_{SI}, and also the expected sample path coupled with 95%-confidence ellipses in the space of X_S and X_{SI}.

On a slightly different note, the existence of a giant component and the proportion of nodes on the giant component play an important role in percolation theory, especially from an equilibrium point of view in statistical mechanics. Barring the curious case of a degree distribution $\{p_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ such that $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} k^2 p_k = 2\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} k p_k$ and $p_1 = 0$[8], in the light of **A3**, the con-

[7] They are also called "active" nodes in the literature.

[8] Such a degree distribution is exceptional in that quite different behaviours of the giant component are observable for such a degree distribution. Please refer to Janson and Luczak (2009) for examples of such behaviours.



Fig 4: The figures on the left depict the time evolution of the correlation coefficient between jumps of X_S and X_{SI} as estimated from numerical simulations (via Gillespie's algorithm) pitted against theoretical values computed from the functional central limit theorem (Theorem 2). The figures on the right show the expected sample path in the space of X_S and X_{SI}. The two lines correspond to numerical simulation and theoretical values. The dotted ellipses are the 95%-confidence ellipses. The arrows indicate the time direction. **(Above)** Poisson distribution with $\lambda = 5$. **(Below)** r-regular random graph with $r = 3$ In both cases, $n = 1000, \alpha_S = 0.9$, and $\beta = 0.5$.



Fig 5: Comparison of simulated sample paths. **(Left)** Sample paths obtained through Gillespie's algorithm. **(Right)** Sample paths obtained through diffusion approximation. Simulation setting: $n = 1000$, Negative Binomial distribution with $r = 2, p = 3/4$.



Fig 6: **(Left)** Comparison of the time evolution of the fraction of nodes on the percolated component for different degree distributions with the same mean. The 2-degree distribution in the plot refers to the degree distribution $p_k = 0.5 \times \mathbb{1}(k = 1) + 0.5 \times \mathbb{1}(k = 9)$, where none of the nodes have degree 5 yet the average degree is 5. This presents a pathological case and highlights the need to take into account higher moments of the degree distribution. **(Right)** Comparison of discounted cost against increasing average degree for different degree distributions. With increasing average degree the graphs lose sparsity and facilitate spread of computer virus. Therefore they incur higher cost. When the average degree is very small, regular random graphs seem favourable compared to random graphs with negative binomial distributed degrees. The costs are computed with $n = 1000, \gamma = 1$.

dition for existence of a giant component is satisfied (see Molloy and Reed (1995)) for our stochastic SI model in the traditional sense. To be precise, setting $\alpha_S = 1$ and taking asymptotic limit in time, one finds the fraction of nodes on the giant component to be $1-\psi(\theta_\infty)$, where $\theta_\infty \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is the solution of $\partial\psi(1)\theta_\infty = \partial\psi(\theta_\infty)$ (see Janson, Luczak and Windridge (2014); Molloy and Reed (1998)). However, as mentioned earlier, we take a non-equilibrium point of view and concern ourselves with the time evolution of the fraction of nodes on the infected part of the graph, the "percolated component" . As a by-product of the scaling limits in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, the variable θ defined in Equation 6 gives us a tool to approximate the proportion of susceptible individuals in the population (and hence, the proportion of infected nodes as well). We expect the fraction of infected individuals to converge in probability to $1 - \alpha_S\psi(\vartheta)$ as $n \to \infty$, ϑ being the scaling limit of θ. A fixed time interval $\mathcal{T} = [0, T]$ enables us to look for critical values in the space of the infection rate $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$. This allows us to decide whether the system "percolates" in the sense that the fraction of nodes on the percolated component achieves a value greater than a pre-specified one (usually close to unity) by time T. Using different colours in Figure 2, we depict the fraction of nodes on the percolated component as a function of both time and the infection rate β (let us call such a figure a percolation profile) for three degree distributions with the same mean. Questions such as whether the system with an infection rate β "percolates" are immediately settled by drawing a horizontal line and checking whether the line passes through the colour corresponding to the pre-specified level. Also, see Figure 6 for another comparative view, highlighting the need to take into account higher moments of the degree distribution.

4.2. *Spread of Computer Viruses.* Epidemic models have been used in the context of spread of computer virus for some years now. The correspondence between our model and the application area under consideration is apparent without requiring much change in nomenclature. Early works in this direction did not take into account the inherent graph structure and assumed "homogeneous mixing" in some sense. Recent works, however, duly studied it on realistic computer networks, often modelled as random graphs. Lelarge, for example, based much of his work on classical Erdös Rényi random graphs and configuration models (see, *e.g.*, Lelarge (2012)). Interested readers are requested to have a look at Kephart and White (1993); Lelarge (2012); Wierman and Marchette (2004) and references therein for an overview of relevant literature. Applying our results, we can approximate the number of virus-affected computers over time and the edges of different types. Additionally,

one might be interested in estimating some "cost" involving the count variables in a linear or non-linear fashion. For instance, if the cost function is polynomial in the count variables, the mixed moments of various orders appearing in the expression of the expected cost can be approximated by means of Theorem 2. To illustrate the concept using a toy example, we assume an exponentiated form for the incurred cost to emphasise the severity of a computer being virus-affected. Then, for example, we can compute time-discounted expected incurred cost and study how it behaves with decreasing sparsity of the underlying graph. To this end, let us define

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(t) &:= e^{cX_I(t)}, \\
C_\psi &:= \mathrm{E}[\int_{\mathcal{T}} e^{-\gamma t} I(t)\, dt] = \int_{\mathcal{T}} e^{-\gamma t} \mathrm{E}[I(t)]\, dt,
\end{aligned} \tag{35}
$$

where $c > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ are constants. In Figure 6, we plot the discounted cost C_ψ against an increasing average degree of the underlying graph, engendering decreasing sparsity. When the average degree is very small, regular random graphs seem favourable compared to random graphs with negative binomial distributed degrees.

5. Conclusion and Future Work. We conclude the paper with a short discussion. We study the susceptible-infected (SI) model by formulating a continuous time stochastic process on configuration model random graphs. Even though this is a simple infection model, the Markovian process on the entirety of the random graph suffers state space explosion as n, the number of nodes in the graph grows to infinity. Consequently analysis of the non-Markovian aggregate process also becomes complicated. Therefore, scaling limits retaining key features of the network are of virtue. Although a number of scaling limits in the form of laws of large numbers have surfaced over the years, appropriate diffusion approximations are not yet fully explored. Our functional central limit theorem attempts to complement the laws of large numbers already available in the literature. In particular, our FCLT lends itself as an approximating tool for applications where laws of large numbers are inadequate, *e.g.*, in situations involving higher order moments.

In our present work, we have disregarded "recovery" of the infected nodes. The reason behind this exclusion is our inability to evaluate the neighbourhood distribution of an infected node in the presence of spontaneous recovery of its neighbours. One difficulty is that, unlike the susceptible nodes (of a given degree) that are untouched by the process of infection and hence, receive identically distributed neighbourhoods upon uniformly random matching of half-edges, the infected nodes are not identically distributed because

they already possess partially formed neighbourhoods consisting of infected and recovered neighbours.[9] The hypergeometric argument as mentioned in Remark 1 seems therefore inadequate. For the purpose of obtaining a law of large numbers, we can circumvent this difficulty by suitably bounding the jump sizes of different martingales arising in the proof by the degrees of the nodes concerned. Therefore, we actually do not need the exact neighbourhood distribution of an infected individual for deriving laws of large numbers. However, to establish an FCLT, one needs to find the limit of the quadratic covariation process that would involve the task of approximating quantities such as $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}\sum_{i\in I_k} X_{IS,i}^2$, where I_k is the collection of degree-k nodes that are infected and $X_{IS,i}$ is the number of susceptible neighbours of an infected individual of degree k. We suspect an elaborate bookkeeping of the infection spreading process would be necessary to approximate such quantities. We have not been able to find a simple workaround so far and intend to pursue this problem in the near future.

APPENDIX A: HYPERGEOMETRIC MOMENTS

In this section, we compute various (conditional) moments that are useful for our derivations. The following moments are computed keeping in mind Remark 1. Let us use the shorthand notation $\varsigma(n_{SI}; X_{SI}, X_{S\bullet}, k) := \mathrm{P}(X_{SI,i} = n_{SI}, X_{SS,i} = k - n_{SI})$, the probability being conditional on the process history as given in Remark 1.

In a straightforward fashion,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}[(X_{SI,i})_3] &= \sum_{n_{SI}} (n_{SI})_3 \frac{\binom{X_{SI}}{n_{SI}}\binom{X_{S\bullet}-X_{SI}}{k-n_{SI}}}{\binom{X_{S\bullet}}{k}} \\
&= \sum_{n_{SI}} (n_{SI})_3 \frac{\frac{(X_{SI})_3}{(n_{SI})_3}\binom{X_{SI}-3}{n_{SI}-3}\binom{(X_{S\bullet}-3)-(X_{SI}-3)}{(k-3)-(n_{SI}-3)}}{\frac{(X_{S\bullet})_3}{(k)_3}\binom{X_{S\bullet}-3}{k-3}} \\
&= \frac{(k)_3(X_{SI})_3}{(X_{S\bullet})_3} \sum_{n_{SI}} \varsigma(n_{SI}; X_{SI}-3, X_{S\bullet}-3, k-3) \\
&= \frac{(k)_3(X_{SI})_3}{(X_{S\bullet})_3}.
\end{aligned}$$

[9] This corresponds to the part of the graph that has already been revealed up to a given time. Recall the construction of the configuration model random graph where the graph is dynamically revealed as infection spreads (see Section 3).

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}[(X_{SI,i})_2] &= \sum_{n_{SI}} (n_{SI})_2 \frac{\binom{X_{SI}}{n_{SI}}\binom{X_{S\bullet}-X_{SI}}{k-n_{SI}}}{\binom{X_{S\bullet}(t)}{k}} \\ &= \frac{(k)_2 (X_{SI})_2}{(X_{S\bullet})_2},\end{aligned}$$

whence we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}^3] &= \mathrm{E}[(X_{SI,i})_3] + 3\mathrm{E}[(X_{SI,i})_2] + \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}] \\ &= \frac{(k)_3 (X_{SI})_3}{(X_{S\bullet})_3} + 3\frac{(k)_2 (X_{SI})_2}{(X_{S\bullet})_2} + k\frac{X_{SI}}{X_{S\bullet}}.\end{aligned}$$

Proceeding in a similar fashion,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i})_2] &= \sum_{0\le n_{SI}+n_{SS}=k} n_{SI}(n_{SS})_2 \frac{\binom{X_{SI}}{n_{SI}}\binom{X_{S\bullet}-X_{SI}}{n_{SS}}}{\binom{X_S}{k}} \\ &= \sum_{0\le n_{SI}+n_{SS}=k} n_{SI}(n_{SS})_2 \frac{\frac{X_{SI}}{n_{SI}}\binom{X_{SI}-1}{n_{SI}-1}\frac{(X_{SS})_2}{(n_{SS})_2}\binom{X_{S\bullet}-X_{SI}-2}{k-n_{SI}-2}}{\frac{(X_{S\bullet})_3}{(k)_3}\binom{X_{S\bullet}-3}{k-3}} \\ &= \frac{(k)_3 X_{SI}(X_{SS})_2}{(X_{S\bullet})_3}\sum_{n_{SI}} \varsigma(n_{SI},;X_{SI}-1, X_{S\bullet}-3, k-3) \\ &= \frac{(k)_3 X_{SI}(X_{SS})_2}{(X_{S\bullet})_3}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}[(X_{SI,i})_2 X_{SS,i}] &= \frac{(k)_3 (X_{SI})_2 X_{SS}}{(X_{S\bullet})_3}, \\ \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i}] &= \frac{(k)_2 X_{SI} X_{SS}}{(X_{S\bullet})_2}.\end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX B: COMPUTATION OF $\langle M \rangle$

Computation of $\langle M_S \rangle$. Recall that

$$M_S'(t) = X_S(t) - X_S(0) + \beta \int_0^t X_{SI}(s)\, ds,$$

and all the jumps are of unit size. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle n^{-\frac{1}{2}} M'_S \rangle(t) &= \frac{1}{n}\int_0^t \mathrm{E}[(\delta M_S(s))^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\ &= \frac{1}{n}\int_0^t \beta X_{SI}(s)\, ds \\ &= \beta \int_0^t \frac{1}{n} X_{SI}(s)\, ds \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} \beta \int_0^t x_{SI}\, ds,\end{aligned}$$

by a direct application of Theorem 1. Therefore, we have $\langle M_S \rangle(t) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} V_S(t) \coloneqq \int_0^t v_{SI}\, ds$.

Computation of $\langle M_{SS} \rangle$. Recall that

$$M'_{SS}(t) = X_{SS}(t) - X_{SS}(0) + 2\beta \int_0^t \sum_{i \in S} X_{SI,i}(s) X_{SS,i}(s)\, ds.$$

The jump size when a susceptible node i gets infected by one of its neighbours is $2X_{SS,i}$. Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle n^{-\frac{1}{2}} M'_{SS} \rangle(t) &= \frac{1}{n}\int_0^t \mathrm{E}[(\delta M'_{SS}(s))^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\ &= \frac{1}{n}\int_0^t \sum_{i \in S} 4X_{SS,i}^2 \beta X_{SI,i}\, ds \\ &= \int_0^t \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i}\, ds\end{aligned}$$

Using computations in Appendix A, we get, for $i \in S_k$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}[X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i}] &= \mathrm{E}[(X_{SS,i})_2 X_{SI,i}] + \mathrm{E}[X_{SS,i} X_{SI,i}] \\ &= \frac{(k)_3 X_{SI} (X_{SS})_2}{(X_{S\bullet})_3} + \frac{(k)_2 X_{SI} X_{SS}}{(X_{S\bullet})_2}.\end{aligned}$$

Define $C_h^k : \mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ as $C_h^k(t) \coloneqq \mathrm{E}[X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i}]$. We approximate the hypergeometric moments by the corresponding multinomial ones in the limit.

To do so, let us define the corresponding multinomial compensator $C_m^k : \mathcal{T} \times [\xi, 2\partial\psi(1)] \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$C_m^k(t, z(t)) \coloneqq \frac{(k)_3 n^{-3} X_{SI} {X_{SS}}^2}{z(t)^3} + \frac{(k)_2 n^{-2} X_{SI} X_{SS}}{z(t)^2}.$$

See that the above can be bounded by

$$C_m^k(t, z(t)) \leq Lk^3, \tag{36}$$

uniformly in n, for some $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$, because $n^{-1}X_{SI}$ and $n^{-1}X_{SS}$ are uniformly bounded above by virtue of Remark 2 and z is bounded away from zero, by definition. $C_m^k(t, z(t))$ is also Lipschitz continuous in $z(t)$.

Now recall the definition of v from Equation (15) and define

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(t) &\coloneqq \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i} - v_{SS}(x(t), \vartheta(t)) \\
&= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i} - v_{SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta) + v_{SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta) \\
&\quad - v_{SS}(x(t), \vartheta(t)) \\
&= \Delta_1(t) + \Delta_2(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_1(t) &\coloneqq \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i} - v_{SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta), \\
\text{and } \Delta_2(t) &\coloneqq v_{SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta) - v_{SS}(x(t), \vartheta(t)).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that to show $\langle M_{SS} \rangle \xrightarrow{\text{P}} V_{SS}$, it suffices to show $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$. We achieve this by showing $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_1(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$ and $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_2(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$ separately.

Convergence of $\Delta_1(t)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_1(t) &= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i} - v_{SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta) \\
&= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i} \\
&\quad - 4\beta [\frac{n^{-3} X_{SI} X_{SS}^2}{\alpha_S^2} \frac{\partial^3 \psi(\theta)}{(\partial \psi(\theta))^3} + \frac{n^{-2} X_{SI} X_{SS}}{\alpha_S} \frac{\partial^2 \psi(\theta)}{(\partial \psi(\theta))^2}] \\
&= \sum_k [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i} \\
&\quad - 4\beta \{\frac{n^{-3} X_{SI} X_{SS}^2}{\alpha_S^2} \frac{(k)_3 \theta^k p_k}{(\theta \partial \psi(\theta))^3} + \frac{n^{-2} X_{SI} X_{SS}}{\alpha_S} \frac{(k)_2 \theta^k p_k}{(\theta \partial \psi(\theta))^2}\}] \\
&= \sum_k [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i} - 4\beta \alpha_S p_k \theta^k \{\frac{(k)_3 n^{-3} X_{SI} X_{SS}^2}{(\alpha_S \theta \partial \psi(\theta))^3} \\
&\quad + \frac{(k)_2 n^{-2} X_{SI} X_{SS}}{(\alpha_S \theta \partial \psi(\theta))^2}\}] \\
&= \sum_k [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i} - 4\beta \alpha_S p_k \theta^k C_m^k(t, \alpha_S \theta \partial \psi(\theta))].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we define

$$\Delta_1^{(k)}(t) \coloneqq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i} - 4\beta \alpha_S p_k \theta^k C_m^k(t, \alpha_S \theta \partial \psi(\theta)). \tag{37}$$

Note that $\Delta_1(t) = \sum_k \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)$. It therefore boils down to showing that $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\sum_k \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0$ as $n \to \infty$. We achieve this task in two steps. First we prove that the tails of $\sum_k \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)$ are negligible. Second we show that each term $\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)$ converges to zero uniformly in probability for a fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(Step I) Tails are negligible. Let us begin by showing that as $N \to \infty$,

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\sum_{k > N} \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0.$$

Observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k>N}\sum_{i\in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i}| &\leq 4\beta\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k>N}\sum_{i\in S_k} k^3 \\
&\leq 4\beta\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k>N} k^3 X_{S_k} \\
&\leq 8\beta\sum_{k>N} k^3 p_k, \qquad (38)
\end{aligned}
$$

because $n^{-1}X_{S_k} \leq 2p_k$ for sufficiently large n in the light of Remark 2. Again, following Remark 2 and the bound on C_m^k from Equation (36), we get

$$
|\sum_{k>N} 4\beta\alpha_S p_k\theta^k C_m^k(t,\alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta))| \leq 4\beta L\sum_{k>N} k^3 p_k. \qquad (39)
$$

Combining inequalities (38) and (39) in view of **A3**,

$$
\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\sum_{k>N}\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0.
$$

(Step II) Uniform convergence in probability for a fixed k. In addition to Step I, it is sufficient to show $\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$ for an arbitrarily fixed $k\in\mathbb{N}$ to justify $\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\Delta_1(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$. Observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| &= |\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i} - 4\beta\alpha_S p_k\theta^k C_m^k(t,\alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta))| \\
&\leq 4\beta n^{-1}|\sum_{i\in S_k} X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i} - X_{S_k}C_h^k(t)| \qquad (40) \\
&\quad + 4\beta n^{-1}X_{S_k}|C_h^k(t) - C_m^k(t,n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})| \qquad (41) \\
&\quad + 4\beta|n^{-1}X_{S_k}C_m^k(t,n^{-1}X_{S\bullet}) - \alpha_S p_k\theta^k C_m^k(t,n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})| \qquad (42) \\
&\quad + 4\beta\alpha_S p_k\theta^k|C_m^k(t,n^{-1}X_{S\bullet}) - C_m^k(t,\alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta))|, \qquad (43)
\end{aligned}
$$

and we intend to show that each of the above summands converges to zero uniformly in probability.

Define the process $\Delta_{1,1}^{(k)}(t) \coloneqq \sum_{i\in S_k} X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i} - X_{S_k}C_h^k(t)$ is a zero-mean, piecewise-constant, càdlàg martingale with paths in D. The jumps of $\Delta_{1,1}^{(k)}(t)$ take place when a node of degree-k gets infected. Therefore proceeding exactly the same way as we did for the quantity in (22) in the computation of

the limit of $\langle M_{SI} \rangle$, we show

$$\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |n^{-1} \Delta_{1,1}^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0,$$

that is, the quantity in (40) converges to zero uniformly in probability.

For the term in (41), take into account $n^{-1} X_{S_k} \leq 1$ and see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |C_h^k(t) - C_m^k(t, n^{-1} X_{S\bullet})| = & \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} | \frac{(k)_3 X_{SI} (X_{SS})_2}{(X_{S\bullet})_3} + \frac{(k)_2 X_{SI} X_{SS}}{(X_{S\bullet})_2} \\
& - \{ \frac{(k)_3 n^{-3} X_{SI} {X_{SS}}^2}{(n^{-1} X_{S\bullet}(t))^3} + \frac{(k)_2 n^{-2} X_{SI} X_{SS}}{(n^{-1} X_{S\bullet}(t))^2} \} | \\
\leq & \frac{c_1 k^3}{X_{S\bullet}(T) - 2},
\end{aligned}$$

for some $c_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, because $X_{S\bullet}$ is non-increasing on $\mathcal{T} = [0, T]$. Therefore, by **A1**, the quantity in (41) converges to zero uniformly in probability.

The terms in (42) and (43) can be shown to converge to zero uniformly in probability in exactly the same way we did for the terms (24) and (25), respectively. Therefore we do not repeat the same line of argument here.

Having shown the terms in (40), (41), (42) and (43) converge to zero uniformly in probability, we establish that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0, \tag{44}$$

uniformly in probability for any fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Finally, by virtue of Step I and Step II, we obtain

$$\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_1(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0. \tag{45}$$

Convergence of $\Delta_2(t)$. By virtue of the Lipschitz continuity of $v_{SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta)$ on its domain that can be taken as $(0, 1] \times [\xi, 2\partial\psi(1)]^2 \times [\xi, 1]$ and following the same line of argument that we employed to achieve Equation (27) in the computation of the limit of $\langle M_{SI} \rangle$, we establish

$$\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_2(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0 \tag{46}$$

Final Conclusion. Finally in view of (45) and (46), we conclude

$$\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0, \tag{47}$$

which is a sufficient condition for

$$\int_0^t \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 4\beta X_{SS,i}^2 X_{SI,i}\, ds \xrightarrow{\text{P}} \int_0^t v_{SS}(x(s), \vartheta)\, ds$$
$$\implies \langle M_{SS} \rangle(t) \xrightarrow{\text{P}} V_{SS}(t) \coloneqq \int_0^t v_{SS}(x(s), \vartheta)\, ds.$$

Computation of $\langle M_S, M_{SI} \rangle$. Recall that the jumps of M_S are of unit size (in absolute value) while those of M'_{SI} are of size $X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}$ when $i \in S$ gets infected. The jumps of M'_{SI} are of course bounded above by the degree of the node getting infected. Also, note that both M'_S and M'_{SI} are pure jump, càdlàg, zero-mean martingales.

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle n^{-\frac{1}{2}} M'_S, n^{-\frac{1}{2}} M'_{SI} \rangle(t) &= \frac{1}{n} \int_0^t \mathrm{E}[\delta M'_S(s) \delta M'_{SI}(s) \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \int_0^t \sum_{i \in S} \beta X_{SI,i}(-1)(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})\, ds \\
&= \int_0^t \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -\beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})\, ds
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that, for a randomly selected node $i \in S_k$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})] &= \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i}] - \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}^2] \\
&= \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i}] - \mathrm{E}[(X_{SI,i})_2] - \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}] \\
&= \frac{(k)_2 X_{SI} X_{SS}}{(X_{S\bullet})_2} - \frac{(k)_2 (X_{SI})_2}{(X_{S\bullet})_2} - k \frac{X_{SI}}{X_{S\bullet}} \\
&= \frac{(k)_2 X_{SI}}{(X_{S\bullet})_2} (X_{SS} - (X_{SI} - 1)) - k \frac{X_{SI}}{X_{S\bullet}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Define $C_h^k : \mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ as $C_h^k(t) \coloneqq \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})]$. Also define the corresponding multinomial compensator $C_m^k : \mathcal{T} \times [\xi, 2\partial\psi(1)] \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$C_m^k(t, z(t)) \coloneqq \frac{(k)_2 n^{-2} X_{SI}}{z^2(t)} (X_{SS} - X_{SI}) - k n^{-1} \frac{X_{SI}}{z(t)}.$$

Please observe that there exists $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$C_m^k(t, z(t)) \leq L k^2, \tag{48}$$

uniformly in n, because $n^{-1}X_{SI}$ and $n^{-1}X_{SS}$ are uniformly bounded above by virtue of Remark 2 and z is bounded away from zero, by definition. $C_m^k(t, z(t))$ is also Lipschitz continuous in $z(t)$.

Now recall the definition of v from Equation (15) and define

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(t) &\coloneqq \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -\beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) - v_{S,SI}(x(t), \vartheta(t)) \\ &= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -\beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) - v_{S,SI}(n^{-1}X, \theta) \\ &\quad + v_{S,SI}(n^{-1}X, \theta) - v_{S,SI}(x(t), \vartheta(t)) \\ &= \Delta_1(t) + \Delta_2(t),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Delta_1(t) \coloneqq \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -\beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) - v_{S,SI}(n^{-1}X, \theta),$$

$$\text{and } \Delta_2(t) \coloneqq v_{S,SI}(n^{-1}X, \theta) - v_{S,SI}(x(t), \vartheta(t)).$$

To prove $\langle M_S, M_{SI} \rangle \xrightarrow{\text{P}} V_{S,SI}$, it suffices to show $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$. We prove this by showing $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_1(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$ and $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_2(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$ separately.

Convergence of $\Delta_1(t)$.

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_1(t) &= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -\beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) - v_{S,SI}(n^{-1}X, \theta) \\ &= -[\sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) + v_{S,SI}(n^{-1}X, \theta)] \\ &= -[\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{F}_{SI}(X_{SI}, X_{SS}) - \mathbb{H}_{SI}(n^{-1}X_{SI}, n^{-1}X_{SS}, \theta)].\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_1(t)| &= \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{F}_{SI}(X_{SI}, X_{SS}) - \mathbb{H}_{SI}(n^{-1}X_{SI}, n^{-1}X_{SS}, \theta)| \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0, \qquad (49)\end{aligned}$$

by virtue of Lemma 2 from Jacobsen et al. (2016).

Convergence of $\Delta_2(t)$. By virtue of the Lipschitz continuity of $v_{S,SI}(n^{-1}X, \theta)$ on its domain that can be taken as $(0,1] \times [\xi, 2\partial\psi(1)]^2 \times [\xi, 1]$ and following the same line of argument employed to achieve Equation (27) in the computation of the limit of $\langle M_{SI} \rangle$, we establish

$$\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_2(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0. \tag{50}$$

Final Conclusion. Finally in view of (49) and (50), we conclude

$$\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0, \tag{51}$$

which is a sufficient condition for

$$\int_0^t \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -\beta X_{SI,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})\, ds \xrightarrow{\text{P}} \int_0^t v_{S,SI}(x, \vartheta)\, ds$$
$$\implies \langle M_S, M_{SI} \rangle(t) \xrightarrow{\text{P}} V_{S,SI}(t) \coloneqq \int_0^t v_{S,SI}(x, \vartheta)\, ds.$$

Computation of $\langle M_S, M_{SS} \rangle$. Proceeding as before, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle n^{-\frac{1}{2}} M'_S, n^{-\frac{1}{2}} M'_{SS} \rangle(t) &= \frac{1}{n} \int_0^t \mathrm{E}[\delta M'_S(s) \delta M'_{SS}(s) \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \int_0^t \sum_{i \in S} \beta X_{SI,i}(-1)(-2X_{SS,i})\, ds \\
&= \int_0^t \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i}\, ds
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that, for a randomly selected node $i \in S_k$,

$$\mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i}] = \frac{(k)_2 X_{SI} X_{SS}}{(X_{S\bullet})_2}.$$

Define $C_h^k : \mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ as $C_h^k(t) \coloneqq \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i}]$. We also define the corresponding multinomial compensator $C_m^k : \mathcal{T} \times [\xi, 2\partial\psi(1)] \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$C_m^k(t, z(t)) \coloneqq \frac{(k)_2 n^{-2} X_{SI} X_{SS}}{z^2(t)}.$$

Please observe that there exists $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$C_m^k(t, z(t)) \leq Lk^2, \tag{52}$$

uniformly in n, because $n^{-1}X_{SI}$ and $n^{-1}X_{SS}$ are uniformly bounded above by virtue of Remark 2 and z is bounded away from zero, by definition. $C_m^k(t, z(t))$ is also Lipschitz continuous in z.

Now recall the definition of v from Equation (15) and define

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(t) &\coloneqq \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} - v_{S,SS}(x(t), \vartheta(t)) \\
&= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} - v_{S,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta) \\
&\quad + v_{S,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta) - v_{S,SS}(x(t), \vartheta(t)) \\
&= \Delta_1(t) + \Delta_2(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_1(t) &\coloneqq \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} - v_{S,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta), \\
\text{and } \Delta_2(t) &\coloneqq v_{S,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta) - v_{S,SS}(x(t), \vartheta(t)).
\end{aligned}$$

To show $\langle M_S, M_{SS} \rangle \xrightarrow{\text{P}} V_{S,SS}$, it suffices to show $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$. We do this by showing $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_1(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$ and $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_2(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$ separately.

Convergence of $\Delta_1(t)$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_1(t) &= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} - v_{S,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta) \\
&= -\left[-2 \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} \beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} + v_{S,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta)\right] \\
&= -\left[\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{F}_{SS}(X_{SS}, X_{SI}) - \mathbb{H}_{SS}(n^{-1}X_{SS}, n^{-1}X_{SI}, \theta)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_1(t)| &= \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} \left|\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{F}_{SS}(X_{SS}, X_{SI}) - \mathbb{H}_{SS}(n^{-1}X_{SS}, n^{-1}X_{SI}, \theta)\right| \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

by Lemma 2 of Jacobsen et al. (2016).

Convergence of $\Delta_2(t)$. By virtue of the Lipschitz continuity of $v_{S,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta)$ on its domain that can be taken as $(0,1] \times [\xi, 2\partial\psi(1)]^2 \times [\xi, 1]$ and following the same line of argument employed to achieve Equation (27) in the context of $\langle M_{SI} \rangle$, we establish

$$\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_2(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0. \tag{54}$$

Final Conclusion. Finally in view of (53) and (54), we conclude

$$\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0, \tag{55}$$

which is a sufficient condition for

$$\int_0^t \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} 2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i}\, ds \xrightarrow{\text{P}} \int_0^t v_{S,SS}(x, \vartheta)\, ds$$

$$\implies \langle M_S, M_{SS} \rangle(t) \xrightarrow{\text{P}} V_{S,SS}(t) \coloneqq \int_0^t v_{S,SS}(x, \vartheta)\, ds.$$

Computation of $\langle M_{SI}, M_{SS} \rangle$. In a similar fashion, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle n^{-\frac{1}{2}} M'_{SI}, n^{-\frac{1}{2}} M'_{SS} \rangle(t) &= \frac{1}{n} \int_0^t \mathrm{E}[\delta M'_{SI}(s) \delta M'_{SS}(s) \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-}]\, ds \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \int_0^t \sum_{i \in S} \beta X_{SI,i} (X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})(-2X_{SS,i})\, ds \\
&= \int_0^t \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} (X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})\, ds
\end{aligned}$$

Note that, for a randomly selected $i \in S_k$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} (X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})] &= \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i}^2] - \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}^2 X_{SS,i}] \\
&= \mathrm{E}[(X_{SS,i})_2 X_{SI,i}] + \mathrm{E}[X_{SS,i} X_{SI,i}] \\
&\quad - (\mathrm{E}[(X_{SI,i})_2 X_{SS,i}] + \mathrm{E}[X_{SS,i} X_{SI,i}]) \\
&= \mathrm{E}[(X_{SS,i})_2 X_{SI,i}] - \mathrm{E}[(X_{SI,i})_2 X_{SS,i}] \\
&= \frac{(k)_3 X_{SI} (X_{SS})_2}{(X_{S\bullet})_3} - \frac{(k)_3 (X_{SI})_2 X_{SS}}{(X_{S\bullet})_3} \\
&= \frac{(k)_3 X_{SI} X_{SS}}{(X_{S\bullet})_3} (X_{SS} - X_{SI}).
\end{aligned}$$

Define $C_h^k : \mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ as $C_h^k(t) \coloneqq \mathrm{E}[X_{SI,i}X_{SS,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})]$ and also the corresponding multinomial compensator $C_m^k : \mathcal{T} \times [\xi, 2\partial\psi(1)] \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$C_m^k(t, z(t)) \coloneqq \frac{(k)_3 n^{-3} X_{SI} X_{SS}}{z(t)^3}(X_{SS} - X_{SI}).$$

Please observe that there exists $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$C_m^k(t, z(t)) \leq Lk^3, \tag{56}$$

uniformly in n, because $n^{-1}X_{SI}$ and $n^{-1}X_{SS}$ are uniformly bounded above by virtue of Remark 2 and z is bounded away from zero, by definition. $C_m^k(t, z(t))$ is also Lipschitz continuous in $z(t)$.

Now recall the definition of v from Equation (15) and define

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(t) &\coloneqq \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i}X_{SS,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) - v_{SI,SS}(x(t), \vartheta(t)) \\
&= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i}X_{SS,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) - v_{SI,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta) \\
&\quad + v_{SI,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta) - v_{SI,SS}(x(t), \vartheta(t)) \\
&= \Delta_1(t) + \Delta_2(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Delta_1(t) \coloneqq \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i}X_{SS,i}(X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) - v_{SI,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta),$$

and $\Delta_2(t) \coloneqq v_{SI,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta) - v_{SI,SS}(x(t), \vartheta(t))$.

Note that in order to show $\langle M_{SI}, M_{SS} \rangle \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} V_{SI,SS}$, it suffices to prove $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta(t)| \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0$. We achieve this by showing $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_1(t)| \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0$ and $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta_2(t)| \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0$ separately.

Convergence of $\Delta_1(t)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_1(t) &= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} (X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) - v_{SI,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta) \\
&= \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} (X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) \\
&\quad + 2\beta [\frac{n^{-3} X_{SI} X_{SS} (X_{SS} - x_{SI})}{\alpha_S^2} \frac{\partial^3 \psi(\theta)}{(\partial \psi(\theta))^3}] \\
&= \sum_k [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} (X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) \\
&\quad + 2\beta \frac{n^{-3} X_{SI} X_{SS} (X_{SS} - x_{SI})}{\alpha_S^2} \frac{(k)_3 \theta^k p_k}{(\theta \partial \psi(\theta))^3}] \\
&= \sum_k [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} (X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) \\
&\quad + 2\beta \alpha_S p_k \theta^k \frac{(k)_3 n^{-3} X_{SI} X_{SS} (X_{SS} - x_{SI})}{(\alpha_S \theta \partial \psi(\theta))^3}] \\
&= \sum_k [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} (X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) + 2\beta \alpha_S p_k \theta^k C_m^k(t, \alpha_S \theta \partial \psi(\theta))].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we define

$$\Delta_1^{(k)}(t) \coloneqq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} (X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i}) + 2\beta \alpha_S p_k \theta^k C_m^k(t, \alpha_S \theta \partial \psi(\theta)).$$

Observe that $\Delta_1(t) = \sum_k \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)$. It therefore boils down to proving that $\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\sum_k \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$ as $n \to \infty$. We achieve this task in two steps. First we show that the tails of $\sum_k \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)$ are negligible. Second we show that each term $\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)$ converges to zero uniformly in probability for a fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

(Step I) Tails are negligible. Let us begin by showing that as $N \to \infty$,

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}_0} |\sum_{k > N} \Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0.$$

Observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k>N}\sum_{i\in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i}X_{SS,i}(X_{SS,i}-X_{SI,i})| &\leq 2\beta\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k>N}\sum_{i\in S_k} k^3 \\
&\leq 2\beta\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k>N} k^3 X_{S_k} \\
&\leq 4\beta\sum_{k>N} k^3 p_k, \qquad (57)
\end{aligned}
$$

because $n^{-1}X_{S_k} \leq 2p_k$ for sufficiently large n in the light of Remark 2. Again, following Remark 2 and the bound on C_m^k from Equation (56), we get

$$
|\sum_{k>N} 2\beta\alpha_S p_k\theta^k C_m^k(t,\alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta))| \leq 2\beta L\sum_{k>N} k^3 p_k. \qquad (58)
$$

Combining inequalities (57) and (58) in view of **A3**, we get

$$
\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\sum_{k>N}\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0.
$$

(Step II) Uniform convergence in probability for a fixed k. In view of Step I, it is sufficient to show $\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$ for an arbitrarily fixed $k\in\mathbb{N}$ to justify $\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\Delta_1(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0$. Observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| &= |\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i\in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i}X_{SS,i}(X_{SS,i}-X_{SI,i}) \\
&\quad + 2\beta\alpha_S p_k\theta^k C_m^k(t,\alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta))| \\
&\leq 2\beta n^{-1}|\sum_{i\in S_k} X_{SI,i}X_{SS,i}(X_{SS,i}-X_{SI,i}) - X_{S_k}C_h^k(t)| \qquad (59) \\
&\quad + 2\beta n^{-1}X_{S_k}|C_h^k(t) - C_m^k(t,n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})| \qquad (60) \\
&\quad + 2\beta|n^{-1}X_{S_k}C_m^k(t,n^{-1}X_{S\bullet}) - \alpha_S p_k\theta^k C_m^k(t,n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})| \qquad (61) \\
&\quad + 2\beta\alpha_S p_k\theta^k|C_m^k(t,n^{-1}X_{S\bullet}) - C_m^k(t,\alpha_S\theta\partial\psi(\theta))|, \qquad (62)
\end{aligned}
$$

and we intend to show that each of the above summands converges uniformly in probability to zero.

Observe that the process $\Delta_{1,1}^{(k)}(t) := \sum_{i\in S_k} X_{SI,i}X_{SS,i}(X_{SS,i}-X_{SI,i}) - X_{S_k}C_h^k(t)$ is a zero-mean, piecewise-constant, càdlàg martingale with paths in D. The jumps of $\Delta_{1,1}^{(k)}(t)$ take place when a node of degree-k gets infected.

Therefore, following the same line of argument that we used to show convergence of the quantity in (22) to zero uniformly in probability, we establish

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|n^{-1}\Delta_{1,1}^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0,$$

and hence, the term in (59) converges uniformly in probability to zero.

For the term in (60), take into account $n^{-1}X_{S_k} \leq 1$ and see that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|C_h^k(t) - C_m^k(t, n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})| = \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|&\frac{(k)_3 X_{SI}X_{SS}}{(X_{S\bullet})_3}(X_{SS}-X_{SI}) \\ &- \frac{(k)_3 n^{-3}X_{SI}X_{SS}}{(n^{-1}X_{S\bullet})^3}(X_{SS}-X_{SI})| \\ &\leq \frac{c_1 k^3}{X_{S\bullet}(T)-2},\end{aligned}$$

for some $c_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, because $X_{S\bullet}$ is non-increasing on $\mathcal{T} = [0, T]$. Therefore, by **A1**, the quantity in (60) converges to zero uniformly in probability.

The terms in (61) and (62) can be shown to converge uniformly in probability to zero in exactly the same way as the terms in (24) and (25), respectively. Therefore we do not repeat it here.

Having shown the terms in (59), (60), (61) and (62) converge to zero uniformly in probability, we have established that

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\Delta_1^{(k)}(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0, \tag{63}$$

uniformly in probability for any fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Finally, by virtue of Step I and Step II, we obtain

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\Delta_1(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0. \tag{64}$$

Convergence of $\Delta_2(t)$. By virtue of the Lipschitz continuity of $v_{SI,SS}(n^{-1}X, \theta)$ on its domain that can be taken as $(0, 1] \times [\xi, 2\partial\psi(1)]^2 \times [\xi, 1]$ and following the same line of argument employed to achieve Equation (27) in the context of $\langle M_{SI}\rangle$, we establish

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0}|\Delta_2(t)| \xrightarrow{\text{P}} 0. \tag{65}$$

Final Conclusion. Finally in view of (64) and (65), we conclude

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}_0} |\Delta(t)| \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} 0, \tag{66}$$

which is a sufficient condition for

$$\int_0^t \sum_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i\in S_k} -2\beta X_{SI,i} X_{SS,i} (X_{SS,i} - X_{SI,i})\, ds \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} \int_0^t v_{SI,SS}(x,\vartheta)\, ds$$
$$\implies \langle M_{SI}, M_{SS}\rangle(t) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{P}} V_{SI,SS}(t) \coloneqq \int_0^t v_{SI,SS}(x,\vartheta)\, ds.$$

APPENDIX C

LIST OF SYMBOLS

$\alpha = (\alpha_S, \alpha_{SI}, \alpha_{SS})$	The large graph limit of $n^{-1}(X_S, X_{SI}, X_{SS})$.
β	The infection rate.
$\kappa(\vartheta)$	The quantity $\frac{\psi(\vartheta)\partial^2\psi(\vartheta)}{(\partial\psi(\vartheta))^2} = \mathbb{D}^2\psi(\vartheta)$, the limiting ratio of the average excess degree of a susceptible node chosen randomly as a neighbour of an infectious individual, to the average degree of a susceptible node.
$\theta(t)$	The quantity $\exp\big(-\beta\int_0^t \frac{X_{SI}(s)}{X_{S\bullet}(s)}\, ds\big)$, the probability that a degree-1 node that was susceptible at time zero remains susceptible till time $t > 0$.
ϑ	The large graph limit of θ
$\langle Z\rangle$	The predictable quadratic variation of the process Z.
$\mathcal{B}(R)$.	The σ-field of Borel subsets of $R \in \mathbb{R}$.
$\mathbb{D}^r f$	The operator $f^{r-1}\frac{\partial^r f}{(\partial f)^r}$, for a real function f.
$\mathcal{F}_t$	The σ-field generated by the process history up to and including time $t > 0$.
$\mathbb{1}(A)$	The indicator (or characteristic) function of a set A.
$\mathcal{V}$	The collection of all psd 3×3 matrix-valued functions on $\mathcal{T}$ that have psd increments and that are $\mathbf{0}$ at time zero.
$(a)_b$	The quantity $a(a-1)(a-2)\cdots(a-b+1)$ for $a > b$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$.

$[Z]$	The optional quadratic variation of the process Z.
$\psi(x)$	The probability generating function of the degree distribution of the configuration model random graph.
Λ_N	The set $\{1, 2, 3, \ldots, N\}$ for $N \in \mathbb{N}$.
$\mathbb{N}$	The set of natural numbers.
$\mathbb{N}_0$	The set of nonnegative whole numbers.
$\mathbb{R}_+$	The set of positive real numbers.
$\mathbb{R}$	The set of real numbers.
$\mathcal{T}_0$	The set $(0, T]$.
$\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_T$	The time interval $[0, T]$.
$D = D(\mathcal{T})$	The Polish space of real functions f on $\mathcal{T}$ that are right continuous and have left hand limits.
n	The number of nodes in the graph.
p_k	The probability that a randomly chosen node has degree k.
S_k	The set of susceptible individuals of degree k.
$X \coloneqq (X_S, X_{SI}, X_{SS})$	The number of susceptible individuals, number of SI edges and the number of SS edges.
$x \coloneqq (x_S, x_{SI}, x_{SS})$	The ODE limit of $n^{-1}(X_S, X_{SI}, X_{SS})$.
$X_{S\bullet}$	The number of edges between a susceptible node and a node of any other status.
X_{S_k}	The number of of susceptible individuals of degree k.
$X_{SI,i}$, $X_{SS,i}$	The numbers of infected and susceptible neighbours of a susceptible node i.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been co-funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) as part of project C3 within the Collaborative Research Center (CRC) 1053 – MAKI and the National Science Foundation under grant RAPID DMS-1513489. This work was initiated when the first author was visiting Mathematical Biosciences Institute (MBI) at The Ohio State University in Summer 2016. MBI is receiving major funding from the National Science Foundation under the grant DMS-1440386. The first author acknowledges the hospitality of MBI during his visit to the institute.

REFERENCES

Aalen, O. O., Borgan, Ø. and Gjessing, H. a. K. (2008). *Survival and Event History Analysis: A Process Point of View*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Albert, R. (2004). Boolean modeling of genetic regulatory networks. In *Complex networks. Lecture Notes in Phys.* **650** 459–481. Springer, Berlin. MR2108990

Alon, U. (2007). *An introduction to systems biology. Chapman & Hall/CRC Mathematical and Computational Biology Series*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL Design principles of biological circuits. MR2259607

Andersen, P. K., Borgan, Ø., Gill, R. D. and Keiding, N. (1993). *Statistical Models Based on Counting Processes. Springer Series in Statistics*. Springer-Verlag, New York. MR1198884

Andersson, H. (1998). Limit theorems for a random graph epidemic model. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **8** 1331–1349. MR1661200

Barabási, A.-L. and Albert, R. (1999). Emergence of Scaling in Random Networks. *Science* **286** 509–512. MR2091634

Barato, A. C. and Hinrichsen, H. (2009). Nonequilibrium phase transition in a spreading process on a timeline. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics*.

Barato, A. C. and Hinrichsen, H. (2011). Directed percolation with a single defect site. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics*.

Barbour, A. D. and Reinert, G. (2013). Approximating the epidemic curve. *Electron. J. Probab.* **18** no. 54, 30. MR3065864

Barndorff-Nielsen, O. (1963). On the Limit Behaviour of Extreme Order Statistics. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **34** 992–1002. MR0150889

Baroni, E., van der Hofstad, R. and Komjathy, J. (2015). First passage percolation on random graphs with infinite variance degrees. https://arxiv.org/pdf/1506.01255.

Barrat, A., Barthélemy, M. and Vespignani, A. (2008). *Dynamical Processes on Complex Networks*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. MR2797803

Baxter, R. J. (1989). *Exactly solved models in statistical mechanics*. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London Reprint of the 1982 original. MR998375

Bhamidi, S., van der Hofstad, R. and Hooghiemstra, G. (2012). Universality for first passage percolation on sparse random graphs. https://arxiv.org/abs/1210.6839.

Billingsley, P. (1999). *Convergence of Probability Measures*, second ed. *Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York A Wiley-Interscience Publication. MR1700749

Bohman, T. and Picollelli, M. (2012). SIR epidemics on random graphs with a fixed degree sequence. *Random Structures Algorithms* **41** 179–214. MR2956054

Bollobás, B. (2001). *Random Graphs*, second ed. *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics* **73**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. MR1864966

Bollobás, B. and Riordan, O. (2006). *Percolation*. Cambridge University Press, New York. MR2283880

Brauer, F. and van den Driessche, P. (2003). Some directions for mathematical epidemiology. In *Dynamical systems and their applications in biology (Cape Breton Island, NS, 2001). Fields Inst. Commun.* **36** 95–112. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI. MR1969485

Callaway, D. S., Newman, M. E., Strogatz, S. H. and Watts, D. J. (2000). Network robustness and fragility: Percolation on random graphs. *Physical Review Letters* **85** 5468.

Chatterjee, S. and Durrett, R. (2009). Contact processes on random graphs with

power law degree distributions have critical value 0. *Ann. Probab.* **37** 2332–2356. MR2573560

Decreusefond, L., Dhersin, J.-S., Moyal, P. and Tran, V. C. (2012). Large graph limit for an SIR process in random network with heterogeneous connectivity. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **22** 541–575. MR2953563

Durrett, R. (2010a). *Random Graph Dynamics. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. MR2656427

Durrett, R. (2010b). Some features of the spread of epidemics and information on a random graph. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **107** 4491-4498.

Durrett, R. (2010c). *Probability: Theory and Examples*, fourth ed. *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. MR2722836

Fleming, T. R. and Harrington, D. P. *Counting Processes and Survival Analysis*.

Gleeson, J. P. (2011). High-Accuracy Approximation of Binary-State Dynamics on Networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** 068701.

Graham, M. and House, T. (2014). Dynamics of stochastic epidemics on heterogeneous networks. *J. Math. Biol.* **68** 1583–1605. MR3201906

Helland, I. S. (1982). Central limit theorems for martingales with discrete or continuous time. *Scand. J. Statist.* **9** 79–94. MR668684

Hinrichsen, H. (2006). Non-equilibrium phase transitions. *Phys. A* **369** 1–28. MR2246565

Jacobsen, K. A., Burch, M. G., Tien, J. H. and Rempała, G. A. (2016). The Large Graph Limit of a Stochastic Epidemic Model on a Dynamic Multilayer Network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.02809*.

Janson, S. (2009). The Probability That a Random Multigraph is Simple. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **18** 205–225.

Janson, S. and Luczak, M. J. (2009). A new approach to the giant component problem. *Random Structures Algorithms* **34** 197–216. MR2490288

Janson, S., Luczak, M. and Windridge, P. (2014). Law of large numbers for the SIR epidemic on a random graph with given degrees. *Random Structures Algorithms* **45** 726–763. Paging previously given as: 724–761. MR3275704

Joo, J. and Lebowitz, J. L. (2004). Pair approximation of the stochastic susceptible-infected-recovered-susceptible epidemic model on the hypercubic lattice. *Phys. Rev. E (3)* **70** 036114, 9. MR2130001

Karatzas, I. and Shreve, S. E. (1991). *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*, second ed. *Graduate Texts in Mathematics* **113**. Springer-Verlag, New York. MR1121940

Kephart, J. O. and White, S. R. (1993). Measuring and modeling computer virus prevalence. In *Research in Security and Privacy, 1993. Proceedings., 1993 IEEE Computer Society Symposium on* 2-15.

Kermack, W. O. and McKendrick, A. G. (1927). A Contribution to the Mathematical Theory of Epidemics. In *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: mathematical, physical and engineering sciences* **115** 700–721. The Royal Society.

Lelarge, M. (2012). Diffusion and cascading behavior in random networks. *Games Econom. Behav.* **75** 752–775. MR2929480

Linder, F., Tran-Gia, J., Dahmen, S. R. and Hinrichsen, H. (2008). Long-range epidemic spreading with immunization. *J. Phys. A* **41** 185005, 11. MR2453965

Mata, A. S., Ferreira, R. S. and Ferreira, S. C. (2014). Heterogeneous pair-approximation for the contact process on complex networks. *New Journal of Physics* **16** 053006.

Meyer, P. A. (1962). A decomposition theorem for supermartingales. *Illinois J. Math.*

6 193–205. MR0159359

Miller, J. C. (2011). A note on a paper by Erik Volz: SIR dynamics in random networks [MR2358436]. *J. Math. Biol.* **62** 349–358. MR2771177

Miller, J. C., Slim, A. C. and Volz, E. M. (2012). Edge-based compartmental modelling for infectious disease spread. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **9** 890–906.

Molloy, M. and Reed, B. (1995). A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Seminar on Random Graphs and Probabilistic Methods in Combinatorics and Computer Science, "Random Graphs '93" (Poznań, 1993)* **6** 161–179. MR1370952

Molloy, M. and Reed, B. (1998). The size of the giant component of a random graph with a given degree sequence. *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **7** 295–305. MR1664335

Newman, M. E. J. (2002). Spread of epidemic disease on networks. *Phys. Rev. E (3)* **66** 016128, 11. MR1919737

Pastor-Satorras, R. and Vespignani, A. (2001a). Epidemic Spreading in Scale-Free Networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** 3200–3203.

Pastor-Satorras, R. and Vespignani, A. (2001b). Epidemic dynamics and endemic states in complex networks. *Phys. Rev. E* **63** 066117.

Rao, K. M. (1969). On Decomposition Theorems of Meyer. *Math. Scand.* **24** 66–78. MR0275510

Rebolledo, R. (1980). Central limit theorems for local martingales. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **51** 269–286. MR566321

Stauffer, D. and Aharony, A. (1992). Introduction to Percolation Theory. **96**.

van der Hofstad, R. (2010). Percolation and random graphs. In *New perspectives in stochastic geometry* 173–247. Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford. MR2654679

van der Hofstad, R. (2017). *Random Graphs and Complex Networks* **1**. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics.

Volz, E. (2008). SIR dynamics in random networks with heterogeneous connectivity. *J. Math. Biol.* **56** 293–310. MR2358436

Wierman, J. C. and Marchette, D. J. (2004). Modeling computer virus prevalence with a susceptible-infected-susceptible model with reintroduction. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.* **45** 3–23. MR2041255

Wasiur R. KhudaBukhsh
Heinz Koeppl
Bioinspired Communication Systems
Technische Universität Darmstadt
Rundeturmstrasse 12
64283 Darmstadt
Germany
E-mail: wasiur.khudabukhsh@bcs.tu-darmstadt.de
heinz.koeppl@bcs.tu-darmstadt.de
URL: http://www.bcs.tu-darmstadt.de/

Casper Woroszylo
Grzegorz A. Rempała
Mathematical Biosciences Institute
The Ohio State University
Jennings Hall 3rd Floor, 1735 Neil Ave.
Columbus, OH 43210
United States of America
E-mail: woroszylo.1@mbi.osu.edu
rempala.3@osu.edu
URL: https://mbi.osu.edu/